



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE STORY OF WORDSWORTH'S "CINTRA"

BY JOHN EDWIN WELLS

Of the vital importance for the Great War of Wordsworth's political writings in prose and verse composed during the struggle of England with Napoleon, there has been a growing recognition since the autumn of 1914. In them, and notably in the tract on the Convention of Cintra, are enunciated with no less power than nobility the essential principles of moral and political truth that have inspired and supported the associated peoples against Germany, and that are today, more clearly than ever before, realized to be the bases of any enduring formula for a rightly constituted world.

That the pamphlet on the Convention of Cintra has been little read, is but another token of the unwillingness of the average person to give himself to the contemplation of lofty thought uttered in the language of exalted passion. From the time of its publication in 1809, the tract has been a theme of eloquent praise by a long line of eminent men of widely varied interests. Scott,¹ Lamb,² Southey,³ and Henry Crabb Robinson⁴ were tremendously affected by it. Canning "considered it the most eloquent production of the kind since the days of Burke."⁵ Coleridge judged it to be "the grandest politico-moral work since Milton's *Defensio Pop. Anglic.*";⁶ he felt that "a considerable part is almost a self-robbery from some great philosophical poem, of which it would form an appropriate part, and be fitlier attuned to the high dogmatic eloquence, the oracular tone of impassioned blank verse";⁷ and he declared that "the Work (if it should die) would die of a plethora of the highest qualities of combined philosophic and poetic genius."⁷ Rogers admired it, and, to Lockhart, who guessed it was from Burke, he read a passage with

¹ Lockhart, *Life*, 1856, 3. 260-1.

² Letter to Coleridge, October 30, 1809.

³ See below, *passim*.

⁴ *London Review*, 1809, 2. 231 ff.

⁵ *Memoirs of Wordsworth*, 1. 405; *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1850, 1. 617.

⁶ Harper, *William Wordsworth*, 2. 174.

⁷ *Letters of Coleridge*, Boston and New York, 1895, 2. 549.

praise of its beauty.⁸ Christopher Wordsworth wrote, ". . . but one judgment can exist with respect to the importance of [its] principles, and the vigorous and fervid eloquence with which they are enforced. If Mr. Wordsworth had never written a single verse, this Essay alone would be sufficient to place him in the highest rank of English poets."⁹

In a burst of enthusiastic praise, Professor Dowden characterized the tract as "Wordsworth's loftiest, most passionate, most prophetic-like utterance as a prose-writer. . . . It may be classed in the small group of writings dealing with occasional incidents and events in their relation to what is everlasting and universal, at the head of which stands Milton's prophetic pamphlet, the sublime 'Areopagitica.' . . . Here Wordsworth could look into the life of things; here could submit himself to the vast impalpable motives of justice, and of the deep fraternity of nations; he could pursue those trains of reasoning which originate from, and are addressed to, the universal spirit of man."¹⁰ Professor Harper has declared the work to be "the last great example of a Miltonic tract." "His style is as heroic as his theme. . . . If we had heroic minds, this would be the language in which to address them. A student of rhetoric or of logic will find here a noble example, in the grand style, of both arts. They have been used in this pamphlet as the instruments of a passion that without them would have destroyed the mind in which it raged."¹¹

Chiefly on the basis of the pamphlet, Professor Dicey reiterated during the Great War that the salvation of England was due in 1803-1815, and must be due in "this present crisis," "to the resolution and faith of the British people"; and declared that "the record or the expression of this saving faith . . . will be found, in its best and clearest form, in the political ideas or, in other words, in the statesmanship of Wordsworth."¹² He showed that Wordsworth anticipated by more than twenty years the nationalism of Mazzini,¹³

⁸ *Recollections of the Very Rev. G. D. Boyle*, 68.

⁹ *Memoirs of Wordsworth*, 1. 399.

¹⁰ *Studies in Literature*, London, 1902, 149, 151.

¹¹ *William Wordsworth*, 2. 176-7.

¹² *Nineteenth Century*, 77. 1042; *Statesmanship of Wordsworth*, Oxford, 1917, 116 ff.; Reprint of tract, Oxford, 1916, vii ff.

¹³ *Statesmanship of Wordsworth*, 80.

and the full growth of nationalism by at least forty years.¹⁴ He emphatically maintained that "the foreign policy of England during the nineteenth century, in so far as it coincided with the statesmanship of Wordsworth, was markedly successful; in so far as it deviated from his statesmanship, it ended in failure, or at best in very dubious success."¹⁵ And he found in the pamphlet a characterization of the causes of the Great War, and for the world today a rich treasury of lessons.¹⁶

The political aspects and significance of the pamphlet have been extensively discussed by Professor Dicey. But biographers and critics have ignored or hurried over the circumstances of its writing and publication. In their meagre statements regarding these matters, many have repeated errors and misconceptions, even failing to collate and arrange the materials on which they rest. None has shown the nature or the degree of the participation of Coleridge and De Quincey in the work, and most have fostered an erroneous impression of the efficiency of De Quincey's labors.

The following pages¹⁷ deal with these issues. In addition, they present what seem to be correct datings for the letters in question; show the various stages of conception and composition of the pamphlet; indicate the facts of transmission, and the peculiarities of the various texts; afford a closer view of the life at Allan Bank during the winter and spring of 1808-1809 than has yet been

¹⁴ *Nineteenth Century*, 77. 1053; *Statesmanship of Wordsworth*, 82, note.

¹⁵ *Nineteenth Century*, 77. 1054; *Statesmanship of Wordsworth*, 96; Oxford reprint of tract, xxxiii.

¹⁶ *Nineteenth Century*, 77. 1058; *Statesmanship of Wordsworth*, 116 ff.

¹⁷ The following abbreviations are used in this article:

- LLP *Letters from the Lake Poets to Daniel Stuart*, ed. E. H. Coleridge, London, 1889.
 LWF *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, ed. Knight, 3 vols., Boston and London, 1907.
 LC *Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. E. H. Coleridge, 2 vols., Boston and New York, 1895.
 PW *Prose Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. Knight, 2 vols., London, 1896.
 1809 The 1809 text of the tract on the Convention of Cintra.
 G The text of the tract in *Prose Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. Grosart, London, 1876, Vol. 1.
 K The text of the tract in PW, Vol. 1.
 Oxf *Wordsworth's Tract on the Convention of Cintra*, with introduction by A. V. Dicey, Oxford University Press, London, 1915.

developed; suggest the state of mind and the attitudes of the prominent persons concerned; and perhaps will be felt to illustrate conditions and features that are not uninteresting in themselves, and that are representative of common human nature and experience.

The reader must bear in mind the limitations of this study. Never for a moment must he permit these homely and, from a larger view, trivial details to obscure his consciousness that the only ultimate interest of most of them is their as it were accidental association with a lofty spirit bound on a more than mortal emprise. He who would tell the story of the inner making of Wordsworth's *Cintra* would compose a sublime epic of the soul.

In June, 1808, the Wordsworths moved from their cramped home in Dove Cottage to the more commodious dwelling at Allan Bank that they were to occupy until the spring of 1811. The domestic conditions were extremely trying. The grounds were in disorder. The building was not finished, and the construction was very defective. The house was cold, the cellars were wet, the chimneys smoked intolerably. As the wind changed, the several rooms varied in degrees of uninhabitableness. The woodwork, the dishes, the furniture, the carpets, all were covered with soot. "In fact," wrote Dorothy to Mrs. Clarkson on December 8 (LWF 1.388), "we have seldom an hour's leisure (either Mary or I) till after 7 o'clock (when the children go to bed), for all the time that we have for sitting still in the course of the day we are obliged to employ in scouring (and many of our evenings also)." The ordinary housework was far too heavy for the two maids and the little girl-helper. The baking and much of the washing was done at home. Two pigs had to be attended to. The cook cared for the cow in a stable two field-lengths distant.¹⁸

The very commodiousness of the house added to the burdens. From September into February, Coleridge domesticated with them; and, from November into February, De Quincey was their guest. Sara Hutchinson was a member of the household. During the autumn, there were regularly thirteen in the family. John, the

¹⁸ See *Memoirs*, 1. 382; LWF, 1. 386, 388, 430; Knight, *Life of Wordsworth*, 1. 432; De Quincey's account of the house and the poet's dealings with the landlord, Mr. Crump of Liverpool, Masson ed. *Collected Writings*, Edinburgh, 1889, 2. 358.

oldest of the four children, was only five years of age; Catherine was born in September, 1808. For weekends and holidays, Hartley and Derwent Coleridge came to them from school at Ambleside. On one occasion, Mrs. Coleridge stayed a week under their roof, certainly, with her understood "separation" (LWF 1.387) from Coleridge, increasing the difficulties of the situation.¹⁹

Here, through the autumn and winter of 1808-1809, Coleridge, beginning "in tolerable health and better spirits" than Wordsworth had "known him to possess for some time" (LWF 1.377), was feverishly working on the plans for his periodical, the *Friend*, and striving to overcome the innumerable impediments to its publication. The adults of the family were engaged in soliciting support from his already more than generous acquaintance. All were pretending for his encouragement a confidence in the success of the great project, that his ill-health and but too well known irregularity forbade them really to feel as more than a bare possibility—though they feared it was a last hope for him. Sara Hutchinson was devoting herself, as amanuensis and confidant, to relieve Coleridge from the physical labors of the extensive correspondence connected with the projected periodical, and to inspire him from the inertia, the diffusion of effort, the bodily distress, and the despondency, that intermittently possessed him.

It was in such adverse conditions—to which are to be added the inadequateness and uncertainties of the postal arrangements, and the delay and irregularities in the arrival of news, which were incident to the remoteness of Grasmere, and the isolation of Allan Bank—that Wordsworth undertook and carried through the composition of his tract on the Convention of Cintra.

The so-called Convention of Cintra was signed on August 30, 1808. On September 4, Sir Hew Dalrymple sent off a dispatch containing the Convention and the Armistice. These reached London on the 15th, and were published on the 16th.

The news most profoundly agitated the circles at Allan Bank and Keswick. On the 27th, Wordsworth wrote Richard Sharp (LWF 1.380), "We are all here cut to the heart by the conduct of Sir Hew and his brother knight [Sir Harry Burrard] in Portugal. For myself, I have not suffered so much upon any public occasion

¹⁹ See Sara Coleridge's *Memoir and Letters*, 1873, I. 17-20.

these many years." The little group in their isolation sought with the utmost anxiety each bit of news of the ensuing events. Years later, Wordsworth declared to Miss Fenwick, "It would not be easy to conceive with what a depth of feeling I entered into the struggle carried on by the Spaniards for their deliverance from the usurped power of the French. Many times have I gone from Allan Bank in Grasmere Vale, where we were then residing, to the Raise-Gap, as it is called, so late as two o'clock in the morning, to meet the carrier bringing the newspaper from Keswick. Imperfect traces of the state of mind in which I then was may be found in my tract on the Convention of Cintra, as well as in the *Sonnets dedicated to Liberty*." ²⁰ Sara Coleridge wrote of this autumn, "It was during this stay at Allan Bank that I used to see my father and Mr. De Quincey pace up and down the room in conversation. I understood not, nor listened to a word they said, but used to note the handkerchief hanging out of the pocket behind, and long to clutch it. Mr. Wordsworth, too, must have been one of the room walkers. How gravely and earnestly used Samuel Taylor Coleridge and William Wordsworth and my uncle Southey also to discuss the affairs of the nation, as if it all came home to their business and bosoms, as if it were their private concern! Men do not discuss these matters now-a-days, I think, quite in the same tone." ²¹

The correspondence of Southey, Coleridge, and Wordsworth in this and the next year shows their great concern in the Convention and the succeeding developments. But the poets were not willing to confine their feeling to mere private discussion. In October, with others in the neighborhood, they were planning public action. To Humphrey Senhouse, Southey wrote on the 15th, "I have had a visit this morning from S—— and C—— upon the subject of this convention in Portugal. They, and some of their friends are very desirous of bringing before the country, in some regular form, the main iniquity of the business—which has been lost sight of in all the addresses—and of rectifying public opinion by showing it in its true light." He states what is the "true light": Sir Hew Dalrymple "has abandoned our vantage ground, betrayed the cause of Spain and Portugal, and disclaimed, as far as his authority extends, the feelings which the Spaniards are inculcating, and in

²⁰ *Memoirs*, I. 384. See *Sonnets . . . to Liberty*, II. 7, 8.

²¹ *Memoir and Letters*, London, 1873, I. 19.

which lie their strength and their salvation, by degrading into a common and petty war between soldier and soldier, that which is the struggle of a nation against a foreign usurper, a business of natural life and death, a war of virtue against vice, light against darkness, the good principle against the evil one. . . . These sentiments would appear with most effect if they were embodied in a county address, of which the ostensible purport might be to thank his Majesty for having instituted an inquiry, and to request that he would be pleased to appoint a day of national humiliation for this grievous national disgrace. S—— and C—— know many persons who will come forward at such a meeting. Coleridge or Wordsworth will be ready to speak, and will draw up resolutions to be previously approved, and brought forward by some proper person. We will prepare the way by writing in the county papers.”²²

On the 30th, Southey wrote Tom Southey of the proposed address. Party lines being avoided, Lord Lonsdale has been applied to through Senhouse; but Lonsdale “views the Convention in a very different light,” and “will do all he can to prevent a meeting, or oppose anything that may be done at once. . . . If anything is done in Cumberland, here it will originate with Wordsworth: he and Coleridge will set the business in its true light, in the county newspapers, and frame the resolutions, to be brought forward by some weighty persons; and Wordsworth will speak at the meeting, he being a freeholder. We all meet Curwen (by his special desire) at Calvert’s on Friday next, and I suppose the plan of operations will be settled.”²³

But the plans failed, perhaps through the opposition of Lonsdale. To Scott, who felt tremendously regarding the Convention, and who, after reading the first instalments of Wordsworth’s tract in the *Courier*, declared, in a passionate outburst, “I . . . *much agree with him*,” Southey wrote on November 6, “Wordsworth, who left me today, desires his remembrances. He is about to write a pamphlet upon this precious Convention, which he will place in a more philosophical point of view than any body has yet done.”²⁴ Southey wrote W. S. Landor on November 26, “We used our endeavors here

²² *Life and Correspondence*, London, 1850, 3. 175.

²³ *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey*, London, 1856, 2. 116-7.

²⁴ Lockhart, *Life of Scott*, 1856, 3. 260-1; Southey’s *Life and Correspondence*, London, 1850, 3. 180.

to obtain a county meeting and send in a petition which should have taken up the Convention upon its true grounds of honour and moral feeling, keeping all pettier considerations out of sight. Wordsworth,—who left me when he found the business hopeless,—went home to ease his heart in a pamphlet, which I daily expect to hear he has completed.”²⁵

The failure of these schemes was, then, the final force that set Wordsworth to work on the tract. Moreover, the object of the plans, one notes, was to express and to instill the vast moral and political principles that the poets and others of the locality felt to be involved in the Convention. In so far, they prepared for and confirmed the attitude that Wordsworth took, and the ends that he sought, in the pamphlet. From the first, expanding the design for the county petition, the tract was to be made an exemplification of the poet's theory and practice from the days of Racedown and Alfoxden—the testing and evaluation of phenomena, physical, political, literary, moral, by universal and enduring principles. This same practice was to be illustrated later in 1809 (LWF 1.479) in his account of the Lake District for Wilkinson's *Select Views*.

It was, however, no reluctance or lack of enthusiasm on the part of his fellow poets, but Wordsworth's own extreme ardor, that gave him the welcome task. Southey wrote on October 30, “It is some satisfaction to me that I shall be able to leave upon record my opinion upon this infamous Convention, in the ‘History of Portugal.’”²⁶ On this work he was already engaged. On January 13, 1809, the date on which Wordsworth's second essay appeared in the *Courier*, Southey wrote (LLP 397) Daniel Stuart at length on the Peninsular situation, beginning, “If Wordsworth had not undertaken to write upon the Cintra Convention, I believe I should; for no public event ever distressed me so greatly.” As is well known, Coleridge planned for early in 1809 (LC 543; LLP 142) two articles on Spanish affairs for the *Courier*. In December, 1809, and January, 1810, he contributed to the *Courier* eight “letters” on Spanish affairs, which he wished “to be regarded as a kind of supplement to Wordsworth's pamphlet” (LLP 142 note).

On November 6, then, Wordsworth left Keswick for Allan Bank, determined on a pamphlet. He set to work at once. In the

²⁵ Southey's *Life and Correspondence*, 3, 197.

²⁶ *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey*, London, 1856, 2, 116.

"Advertisement" prefaced to the tract, he states, "I began to write upon this subject in November last." The work progressed rapidly. On December 3, he confided to Wrangham (LWF 1.385; *Memoirs* 1.386), "I myself am very deep in this subject, and about to publish upon it; first, I believe in a newspaper for the sake of immediate and wide circulation; and next, the same matter in a separate pamphlet. Under the title of *The Convention of Cintra brought to the Test of Principles; and the People of Great Britain vindicated from the Charge of having prejudged it.*"

On December 4, Dorothy informed Mrs. Marshall (LWF 1.387), "My brother is deeply engaged writing a pamphlet upon the Convention of Cintra, an event which has interested him more than words can express. His first and his last thoughts are of Spain and Portugal. . . ." The house is "at present literally not habitable" for the smoke and dampness, and the consequent labors of the family and the servants, and the lack of quiet. They are distressed with the possible "miserable necessity of quitting Grasmere"; no other house is to be had in the vale. Their only hope is in a final effort through "workmen by the half-dozen making attempts (hitherto unsuccessful) to remedy these evils."—On December 8, to Mrs. Clarkson, Dorothy wrote (LWF 1.389) from the dining room, "Sara and he [Coleridge] are sitting together in his parlour, William and Mary (alas! all involved in smoke) in William's study, where she is writing for him (he dictating). He is engaged in a work that occupies all his thoughts. It will be a pamphlet of considerable length, entitled *The Convention of Cintra brought to the Test of Principles and the People of England justified from the Charge of Prejudging*, or something to that effect. I believe it will first appear in the *Courier* in different sections. Mr. De Quincey, whom you would love dearly, as I am sure I do, is beside me, quietly turning over the leaves of a Greek book. . . ."

The young De Quincey—for he was only in his twenty-fourth year, though one is ever prone to think of him as past middle age!—was still held by his reverent admiration of Coleridge and Wordsworth. He was planning to reside at Dove Cottage in order to be near them, though for long his alert eyes and acute sensibilities had been storing up recognitions that his heroes had many of the frailties of common men. He had won his way permanently into

the affections of the women and the children of the household. "We feel often," continues Dorothy, "as if he were one of the family—he is loving, gentle, and happy—a very good scholar, and an acute logician. . . . His person is unfortunately diminutive, but there is a sweetness in his looks, especially about the eyes, which soon overcomes the oddness of your first feeling at the sight of so very little a man. John sleeps with him, and is passionately fond of him." It is not the disconcertingly critical, and sometimes almost malicious, De Quincey of the later *Reminiscences* who appears in the letters of these times. It is the affectionate, self-effacing friend, eager in serviceableness; the loving play-fellow and teacher of Johnny; and the worshipper of the baby Catherine, whose death several years later was to cause him agonies of grief equalling those of the fondest parent.²⁷

The paper chosen for the initial publication of the "essays" was the *London Courier*, of which Daniel Stuart had been a half-owner since 1802. As early as 1796, almost directly on his becoming proprietor and editor of the *Morning Post*, Stuart had written Coleridge, offering him a guinea a week for contributions in prose and verse. In the *Post*, Coleridge had printed several of his better-known poems before he went to Germany with the Wordsworths on the proceeds of the *Lyrical Ballads* of 1798. After his return, he continued for a time irregularly to perform the duties of political writer and verse contributor to the paper. From that period, Stuart had been his employer when he would accept employment, always his firm friend, and a valued counsellor to whom Coleridge turned with confidence and warm regard, but, as usually, with much too frequent exercise of the privilege to act as he pleased. On his return from Malta in 1806, Coleridge became for a time an assistant editor to Street, managing editor and partner with Stuart in the *Courier*, and dwelt in a room of the *Courier* building. Thenceforward, Coleridge had had intermittent connection with the paper. In his visits to London, the *Courier* office was his place of resort. There, during the period of his series of lectures in the winter of 1807-1808, he occupied his old room. As early as 1801 (LLP 329),

²⁷ See Masson's *Collected Writings of De Quincey*, Edinburgh, 1889, 2. 441; Japp, *De Quincey's Life and Writings*, New York, 1877, 1. 154, 167-8. For De Quincey's fondness for and influence on the children, and the plan that he should be the sole teacher of Catherine, see LWF 1. 453, 463.

the ever self-respecting Wordsworth had felt on sufficiently intimate terms with Stuart to apply to him for the loan of ten pounds in default of aid from Coleridge. The extant correspondence of the two poets with the publisher during our period, clearly indicates his cordial concern, his unfailing patience, and his generous readiness to meet the numerous demands that his proved regard led them freely to make on his personal efforts and his professional experience and connections. From the first days of the project for the *Friend*, through the seven months covering the composition and publication of Wordsworth's tract, Coleridge was confiding to him the minute details of his plans. To him he applied in all the manifold earlier legal, financial, and professional difficulties connected with the ill-starred enterprise.

To this experienced friend it was that Wordsworth turned for the publication of the "essays." On the 9th of December, Coleridge wrote Stuart (LLP 95 ; LC 534), "Wordsworth has nearly finished a series of most masterly Essays on the Affairs of Portugal and Spain, and by my advice he will first send them to you that if they suit *The Courier* they may be inserted." On the 10th, he notified Street, managing editor of the *Courier* (LLP 97), "I shall send the two first to Mr. Stuart by the next post, and the others as soon as ever I hear from him or you."

But, though Wordsworth was evidently working with eager diligence, the statement that the "series" of essays was "nearly finished" appears to be one of Coleridge's characteristic identifications of design and accomplishment. The delays in delivery had already begun. Account had not been taken of the labors of composition, and of the development of the plan in the author's mind. It was a week later, December 17, that Coleridge posted a letter (LLP 108) informing Stuart, "Wordsworth's first Essay, I hope the two first, will be sent to you by this, or the following post." The first, perhaps also the second, essay did come to Stuart soon.

Without waiting farther, Street proceeded to print the "copy." The first instalment appeared in the *Courier* of Thursday, December 27, 1808, page 2, columns 2-4, a total of almost three columns.²⁸

²⁸ None of the editors, critics, or bibliographers gives evidence of having examined the files of the *Courier* for the Wordsworth essays. All who speak of them are content with a statement, apparently based on the first paragraph of the "Advertisement" prefaced to the 1809 edition of the tract, that the articles appeared in December, 1808, and January, 1809,

The article is headed in capitals, "Concerning the / Convention of Cintra, / In Reference to the Principles by which the / Independence and Freedom of Nations Must / Be Preserved or Recovered." It is signed "G." There is no notice of a continuation. The text extends from the beginning of the tract as printed in 1809 and by its several editors, to the end of the paragraph concluding, ". . . the second pledge (and this was from the hand of their Generals), was the Convention of Cintra" (1809, 11 ¶ 1; G, 43 ¶ 1; K, 120 ¶ 1; Oxf, 13 ¶ 1).

Four parts were evidently sent off with fair promptness. But the physical suffering always consequent upon protracted application by the poet, was already manifesting itself. On December 28 (LLP 110), Coleridge wrote Stuart, "I am afraid that Wordsworth's fifth cannot go off, as was intended, in this frank. It is finished, all but the corrections, but his head and [stomach] have been disordered the whole day till late this evening. Consequently, such are our posts, it cannot go off from Kendal till Saturday morning."

With so much "copy" in the printer's hands, such slight delay might have caused comparatively little trouble. Mischance, however, had already prevented the printing of the second instalment. The "Advertisement" to the 1809 edition states, "An accidental loss of several sheets of the manuscript delayed the continuance of the publication" in the *Courier* "till the close of the Christmas holidays"—actually till Friday, January 13. The sheets lost were, evidently, from the second instalment of the tract. In a letter (LLP 153) dated "Tuesday morning," clearly December 27,²⁹

"extending to page 25" of the tract. Curiously, "page 25" remains in all the reprints, despite the fact that each reprint has its own pagination.—A copy of the *Courier* for 1808 and 1809 is in the Yale University Library. The results of my collation of this with the text of the pamphlet are given on pages 65, 69, below.

²⁹ This letter is printed in LLP as No. 45, with a suggestion by the editor (E. H. Coleridge) that it should precede No. 33, dated January 23, if, as it implies, it "was written shortly after the death of Dr. Beddoes (Dec. 28, 1808)." In LC 544 note, the same editor dates Beddoes' death correctly, December 24. The "Tuesday" of the present letter is December 27. The next post for London after Monday night left Ambleside Wednesday morning (LLP 119). The suggested dating is supported by Coleridge's letter of February 3 (LC 543) to Poole, ". . . An accident in London delayed the publication ten days."

Coleridge wrote Stuart, "William received your letter this morning at eleven o'clock. We have been hard at work ever since. It is now nearly three in the morning. However, the Essay has probably benefited by the accident. At all events it has been increased in size. We are very sorry you should have had so much, or indeed any anxiety about the loss of the papers, which has been so easily repaired." This "copy" left by the Ambleside post on Wednesday. In a letter (LLP 101) headed "Monday night," added to one headed "Sunday, Noon," evidently January 1 and 2, 1809,³⁰ Coleridge wrote Stuart, "You will long ere this (on Friday morning I calculate) have received Wordsworth's second Essay, rewritten by me, and in some parts, recomposed." This evidently refers to the work of the night spoken of in the letter just quoted. Coleridge appends a postscript to the Monday letter: "The very post by which your letter was received, Wordsworth sent the Essay, and the answer to your questions."

From some cause—at least partly the pressure of other matter for the *Courier*, and partly difficulties with the manuscript and the postal delays in bearing inquiries and replies (see LLP 119)—the second part of the tract was issued two weeks after its receipt. The piece appeared in the *Courier* of Friday, January 13, page 1, column 4, to the end of page 2, a total of almost five full columns. It was headed in capitals, "Concerning / The Convention of Cintra, / in Relation to the Principles by Which Alone / the Independence and Freedom of Nations / Can Be Maintained or Recovered." Next follows a notice, "Section II. / *Continued from Tuesday's Courier, 27th ult.*" At the end of the article is the notice, "*To be continued.*) G." The text begins with the sentence, "The reader will by this time have perceived . . ." (1809, 11 ¶ 2; G, 43 ¶ 2; K, 120 ¶ 2; Oxf, 13 ¶ 2). It ends with the last words of the paragraph concluding, ". . . and life to the eye and heart of the spectator" (1809, 25 ¶ 1; G, 52 ¶ 2; K, 132 ¶ 1; Oxf, 26 ¶ 1).

³⁰The Friday mentioned is December 30. The post left Ambleside for London on Wednesday mornings (LWF 1. 398, ¶ 1; LLP 119). LLP 99 prints this as No. 30, preceding No. 31, that posted December 17. But the quotation already made from the letter shows that the present letter follows it and also the letter (LLP No. 45, p. 153) that we have dated December 27. The LLP letters should be arranged in the order 29, 31, 45, 32, 30, 33.

The picture suggested by Coleridge's account of the two poets laboring through the night of the 26th, far into the morning, is interesting in itself and in its illustration of a practice common at Dove Cottage and Allan Bank, as at Racedown and Alfoxden. But Coleridge's statements about the fruits of the night's work give it a considerably added import.

Several critics have spoken of the fact that Coleridge contributed passages to the Cintra pamphlet. None, however, has attempted to identify any such passage. Knight quotes (PW 1. xiii) from a letter written by Henry Nelson Coleridge to Dyce on February 6, 1836, and preserved in the Dyce and Forster Library at South Kensington, "A very brilliant portion of Mr. W.'s pamphlet on the Cintra Convention is Coleridge's. They did not think of authorship *meum* and *tuum* then. Few persons are now competent to take an account of that partnership. Indeed who wants to strike any balance?" Knight remarks, "It would be interesting if we could now discover what 'portion' of this 'Tract' was written by S. T. C.; but, in the absence of such a clue, it is extremely interesting to find that the literary co-partnery, begun in the *Lyrical Ballads* of 1798, was continued in *The Convention of Cintra*, as well as in *The Friend*."

But there is direct evidence from the pen of Coleridge that enables us to identify precisely a considerable passage, probably the one in question, as Coleridge's. On February 3, 1809, he wrote Thomas Poole (LC 543), "You will probably have seen two of Wordsworth's Essays in the 'Courier,' signed 'G.' The two last columns of the second, excepting the concluding paragraph, were written all but a few sentences by me. An accident in London delayed the publication ten days." We have seen that the accident was the loss of several sheets of "copy" which was repaired by the night-work of December 26.

The portion of the tract definitely claimed by Coleridge—i. e., the last two columns of the second article, excepting the last paragraph—extends from the words, "not merely in the opinion of those who support him" (1809, 18 l. 27; G, 48 l. 13; K, 126 l. 10 from end; Oxf, 20 l. 14), to the end of the paragraph concluding, ". . . evince the nobler morality indispensable to the latter" (1809, 23 end; G, 52 ¶ 1; K, 131 ¶ 1; Oxf, 25 ¶ 1).

Confirmation that this passage is Coleridge's, and that the article

is the one revamped during the night hours of December 26-27, may appear in Coleridge's remark (see above) that, as a result of that labor, the "essay" had "been increased in size." The article is longer than the first article by about two columns of the *Courier*, just the extent of the passage claimed by Coleridge.

Coleridge's characterization of this second article as "rewritten by me, and in some parts recomposed" (see above), is probably to be taken rather loosely. The poets set to work to fill up a gap caused by the loss of "two or three sheets" (LWF 1.426 ¶ 2). It would be very strange if, at this period, Wordsworth, and Coleridge also, did not make a number of alterations or additions at other places in the text. Either author may have written any of these. They did perceive that they lengthened the article. The matter contributed by Coleridge may include the substitute for the lost sheets. It may be wholly additional. Beyond this it seems at present impossible to identify contributions made by Coleridge to the tract. Certainly, according to the habit of the two friends when together, Coleridge must have been fully acquainted with all the progress of the work up to the middle of February, 1809; and he probably had contributed not only criticism, but, as well, materials and expression. De Quincey must also have been called constantly into consultation. That Coleridge contributed nothing to the long insertion sent De Quincey on March 25 (see below, pages 37 ff.), is clear from Wordsworth's statement to Stuart on March 27 (LLP 337) that he has not seen Coleridge "this month past."

By January 13, then, two sections had been printed, and at least two or three more were in the hands of Stuart. But the third instalment did not appear. There were defects in Wordsworth's "copy" necessitating repeated queries from London. The difficulties with the post were interfering seriously. This is apparent from a letter dated "Monday noon, January 23," and bearing the post-mark "January 28" (LLP 119), in which Coleridge replied to remonstrances by Stuart, "In answer to that part of your letter . . . respecting Wordsworth's copy, I thought I had explained to you the misery of our Post." After stating definitely some of these trials, he says, "In every instance Wordsworth has sent off his answer the first moment possible, and has twice walked out to the Carrier's house after two o'clock in the morning. He is very busy

at his Work." The two elements just indicated must be borne in mind when considering the delays in the publication of the pamphlet itself.

The confusion and delay continued in effect through the printing of the tract. They now forced a recognition that prompt and satisfactory serial publication was impracticable. Accordingly, Wordsworth determined to give up the printing in the *Courier*, and to issue the work only in the pamphlet that from the first had been planned to follow the newspaper publication. In the "Advertisement" prefaced to the tract, Wordsworth states that because of the delay in the issue of the second instalment, "the pressure of public business rendering it then improbable that room could be found, in the columns of the paper, regularly to insert matter extending to such a length—this plan of publication was given up."³¹ The change in plan had been made before February 3, for on that date Coleridge wrote Poole (LC 543), "An accident in London delayed the publication ten days. The whole, therefore, is now publishing as a pamphlet, and I believe with a more comprehensive title."

Wordsworth probably received no remuneration for the *Courier* articles. The pamphlet was published apparently at the author's expense (LLP 154). In 1838, a passage in Gilman's *Life of Coleridge*, and matter in a group of articles on Coleridge contributed to the *Gentleman's Magazine* by Stuart and H. N. Coleridge, led Wordsworth to apprehend with irritation that he would be regarded as having been a paid writer for the *Courier* or *Morning Post*.³² On May 17, 1838 (LLP 384), he protested at length that he, Mary, and Dorothy had no recollection of any payments for any articles; and he begged Stuart to inform him if he had any evidence to the contrary.

As Coleridge's letter of December 27 (LLP 154) shows, Stuart had undertaken, before the appearance of the first *Courier* article,

³¹ See also the letter to Wrangham of April 3, 1809 (LWF I. 426; see note 63).

³² See Campbell's *Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge*, London, 1901, li; *Gentleman's Mag.*, 1838, I. 485, 577, 2. 22, 124. In considering this irritation one must remember Wordsworth's offer to Stuart in 1801 (LLP 329) to write articles in payment of the loan of ten pounds that he asked; and his idea in the spring of 1809 (LWF I. 431-2; see below, page 51) of adding to his income by newspaper writing.

to arrange for the printing and publishing of the pamphlet. The printing was placed with C. and R. Baldwin, New Bridge-street, London. Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, of Paternoster-Row, undertook the publishing.

By the earlier part of February, more "copy" had reached Stuart, who, before the 8th, had written both Coleridge and Wordsworth of his gratification with the work (LLP 123, 330). In a letter posted on the 9th (LLP 333), Wordsworth apologized for having been so dilatory with the manuscript, and promised to make all the haste in his power. The letter shows that his experience with the poet's "copy" for the several articles sent to the *Courier*, had caused Stuart to caution the author against delays, and particularly corrections and additions, and to advise him to get out a first edition with as great haste as possible, leaving his modifications for a second edition. Had this advice been followed, the tract would not have appeared too late to affect the issues it discussed.

Facing the practical conditions of publishing in London, Wordsworth realized more fully the difficulties imposed by the remoteness of Allan Bank. Had he not felt them otherwise, Coleridge's prolonged distresses in arranging for the printing and publication of the *Friend* would have aroused misgivings as to the plan, and also have convinced him that a printing of the sheets on a neighboring press was not feasible, even if it were possible. He resorted to the expedient, commonly unwise, and for him in the conditions especially unadvisable, of having an agent in London see the pamphlet through the press. De Quincey was contemplating an early departure for London. That he was of "old bachelor preciseness, accurate and regular in all he does" (LLP 125) was evident. Moreover, he had been expounding his "determination to have printed under his own eye, immaculate editions of such of the eminently great Classics, English and Greek, as most need it" (LLP 125). Of his devotion to the poet, and application to a task undertaken for him, there could be no question. Accordingly, despite protests by Coleridge—how vigorous one cannot say—that their "young friend's" turn of mind was "anxious yet dilatory, confused from over accuracy, and at once systematic and labyrinthine" (LLP 155-6), Wordsworth commissioned De Quincey to supervise the printing (see also LWF 1.456).

This decision was made in the first weeks of February. Word

was evidently sent to Stuart, who had been receiving the manuscript. On the 15th,³³ Coleridge wrote Stuart a letter posted on the 27th, with some details regarding De Quincey, apparently in reply to the publisher's inquiries as to who he was. He reminded Stuart that he had probably seen De Quincey at the *Courier* offices with him:³⁴ the young man had determined to reside at Grasmere. It is a fact that Wordsworth had taken a lease on Dove Cottage for six years, subletting it to De Quincey (LWF 1.396 ¶ 2). In the new tenant's absence, Dorothy undertook to superintend the repairs to the house, and the furnishing with materials partly purchased by herself for De Quincey, and partly sent on from Manchester by De Quincey's friend, Mrs. Kelsall. With this her letters show her to have been occupied during the next four months or more.³⁵ De Quincey did not take up till November³⁶ the residence that he was to maintain for more than twenty years, and that was to be in his tenancy for still another seven years.

On February 16 or 17,³⁷ De Quincey left Allan Bank for London.

³³ LLP 124, No. 36. Dated "Wednesday morning." Headed by the editor, "Posted February 27, 1809." This properly precedes No. 37, of February 16. The latter says Coleridge has engaged Brown of Penrith to print the *Friend*; the former indicates that Pennington has refused to print the paper, and Coleridge is undecided as to whether to print in the Lake District or in London—he knows of no one who could print the sheets nearer than Liverpool. Letter 35, of "February 10, 1809," tells of Pennington's refusal. Wednesday of Letter 36 would be February 15. On that date the letter was written. The delay in posting from the 15th to the 27th corresponds with the delay in receiving Wilkins' letter of the 16th (LLP 133). On the 27th (LLP 133, l. 2), when he spoke of this latter delay, Coleridge informed Stuart that he had been ill for eight days. LWF 1. 394, dated by me February 28 (see note 37), shows that Coleridge left Allan Bank on the 20th, and was held from day to day till the 27th by illness at Lloyd's at Brathay. He evidently missed the mails, and held the letter expecting to mail it from day to day.

³⁴ See De Quincey's amusing account of Coleridge in lodgings at the *Courier* office, Masson's ed. *Writings*, Edinburgh, 1889, 2. 188, 193.

³⁵ See LWF 1. 418, 419, 433, 442, 466, 470.

³⁶ See LWF 1. 480, 481.

³⁷ LWF 1. 394, No. 186. Dated "Tuesday." Knight adds "[March 10, 1809.]" Japp (*De Quincey Memorials*, N. Y., 1891, 1. 394) prints all this letter, dating it "Tuesday, March 10, 1809." The letter indicates that De Quincey left Grasmere at least ten days past. He has left a record that he quitted Allan Bank in February, 1809 (Masson ed. *Collected Writings of De Quincey*, Edinburgh, 1889, 2. 359, 360). This letter says Cole-

That the task he had undertaken was no light one, is evident from the difficulties that Stuart had experienced with the first instalments sent him in London. We have seen that these were due to the poor postal facilities, and notably to the defectiveness of Wordsworth's "copy" and his proneness to alterations. But De Quincey's undertaking was still more difficult. Wordsworth's letter (LWF 1.456) to Poole, excusing himself, and complaining against De Quincey, after the pamphlet had been printed, shows what a burden the poet had imposed on his agent, and what irrecognition he had of its nature: "Mr. De Quincey . . . took his departure from my house to London; and, in order to save time and expense, I begged that instead of sending the sheets down to me to be corrected, they should be transferred directly to him for that purpose; and I determined to send the remaining portions of the MS. to him as they were finished, to be by him transmitted to the press. This was a most unfortunate resolution; for at the time the subject of punctuation in prose was one to which I had never attended, and had of course settled no scheme of it in my own mind. I deputed that office to Mr. De Quincey. *Hinc illæ lacrimæ!*"

A sufficiently ungrateful task, one would conclude! But with an author of Wordsworth's impatience, and with a work into which the writer was so pouring himself, and from which he hoped for

ridge has been away since "a week yesterday." In a letter to Stuart "Posted March 31, 1809" (LLP 337), written March 26 (see note 43), Wordsworth says he has not seen Coleridge "this month past." This present letter says Coleridge has been ill at Brathay during most of the previous week. Yesterday he went off to Penrith and Appleby about a letter from the Stamp Office at Appleby stating that Wilkins, the distributor, must have instructions from London; so Wordsworth has missed him. A note from Coleridge has stated that he has just about finished the first essay for the *Friend*. Coleridge's letter of February 27 (LLP 133) to Stuart says he has received that day, the 27th, the letter from the Stamp Office at Appleby, saying directions must be obtained from London. He states that he has been very ill for the past eight days, and enjoys writing at the essays for the *Friend*. Evidently the present letter was written Tuesday, February 28.—LLP 125, which I have shown to date from February 15 (which date is confirmed by the matter of this present note), speaks of De Quincey as if Stuart had been told of him, probably of his coming on about the tract, and had inquired about him. This fits in with February 28 as the date for this present letter, for that date makes De Quincey arrive in London at least ten days before, and hence leave Allan Bank on the 16th or 17th at latest.

the public and for himself such great effects, it was one extremely difficult to perform satisfactorily. But we shall find that the burden became much heavier as the weeks passed.

Unfortunately, but few of the letters between Allan Bank and De Quincey during the printing of the pamphlet, are preserved. From these few, however, and others by Wordsworth and Coleridge, may be derived a fair notion of the circumstances connected with the tract up to the time of its issue, and a not uncharacteristic view of the behavior of the persons concerned.

The letters of May show that Stuart was little in touch with the pamphlet during its actual printing. In all this period, Coleridge was absent from Grasmere.³⁸ Moreover, he was now preoccupied with his plans for the *Friend*, with the composition of the first essays, and with the details of publication for the repeatedly postponed initial number. At Allan Bank the weeks to the end of March were feverish with the labor of composition and correction. Up to June, the household was driven by ups and downs of fear and hope³⁹ regarding the timely appearance of the tract, and the effects of it on public affairs and the poet's own prospects. All were harassed with apprehensions regarding Coleridge and his impracticable and as yet fruitless expenditures and efforts on the still delayed *Friend*. The family was feeling the financial straits that led Wordsworth in April (LWF 1.431-2) seriously to contemplate taking up newspaper work to eke out a living. In addition to the ordinary domestic duties and the trials imposed by the defective house, early and late Mary, Dorothy, and Sara Hutchinson encouraged and quieted the agitated poet, and sought to keep the peace with De Quincey by affectionate letters to him and by remonstrances with the impatient author. With Wordsworth they discussed his developing ideas; and from his dictation they took the fresh paragraphs and the additions and corrections that his constitutional incapacity for extended penmanship prevented him from writing with his own hand.

Wordsworth, as well as De Quincey, realized the importance of

³⁸ In a letter to Stuart posted on March 31 (LLP 337), Wordsworth says he has not seen Coleridge "this month past." To Poole he wrote on March 30, "Coleridge has not been here this month" (Knight, *Life of Wordsworth*, 2. 134.) On May 25, he wrote (LLP 346), "It is nearly three months since he left us, and I have not heard from him lately."

³⁹ See LWF 1. 431-2, 459 ¶ 2, 450 ¶¶ 3-4, 464; LLP 334 ¶ 2, 353 ¶ 2.

expedition. When De Quincey left Grasmere on February 16 or 17, it was evidently understood that the later parts of the "copy" should be sent to him very soon. Over-fearful of dereliction, De Quincey went directly to London, hurrying through Oxford, and arriving at the metropolis after a very unpleasant journey. There he waited a week before receiving any communication from Grasmere. The story is told in Dorothy's letter (LWF 1.394) to him of "Tuesday," February 28 (see above, note 37):

"Two things we grieved for; your miserable cold ride on the outside of the coach, and that you should not have felt yourself at liberty to stay at Oxford for rest, and for arranging any business that you might have there. After this hurrying it would be very mortifying to you to have to wait day after day for our letters, even a whole week, for our earliest despatches could not reach you till last Saturday. I have explained the cause of this delay. My brother was indeed very poorly, his head having been continually tormented, and especially upon his pillow at night with those dreadful headaches, which you know he, in his gloomy way, calls apoplectic. He is now very well, and after he once got forward with his work, he went on rapidly with perpetual animation. Do tell us how you like the conclusion. Mary and I thought the whole was written with great dignity; but we, as well as my brother, could not help regretting that he had not more time to reconsider it. You know he never likes to trust anything away fresh from the brain. He is now engaged in making an addition to one paragraph, which is to be transcribed on the other side of this sheet. I hope he will have done in time to save this day's post (Tuesday); otherwise I fear the types will be arranged by the printer, and you and he will have a great deal of trouble."

But a postscript tells that the poet could not finish in time; "therefore I send this to beg that you will *stop the Press* at the words 'career in the fulness of—.' The addition will be about a folio sheet. He sent off yesterday a letter with two or three corrections, addressed to you at Marybone.⁴⁰ . . . I hope your troubles and perplexities in this affair will end with this."

So, what at the time seemed to Wordsworth the concluding passages of the tract, had been sent to reach De Quincey by Saturday, February 25. Several corrections had been forwarded on the 27th; an additional paragraph was to follow.

The statement in Dorothy's letter that Wordsworth was "making an addition to one paragraph," and the urgent "*stop the Press* at

⁴⁰ Japp (*De Quincey Memorials*, 1. 149 ff.) shows that most of the letters were addressed to 82 Great Titchfield Street, Cavendish Square, where De Quincey stayed from early in this sojourn in London.

the words 'career in the fulness of—,' show that this paragraph—the fifth from the end of the tract as printed—was not the concluding paragraph on February 28. The addition then preparing was to cover "about a folio sheet." If it was sent, and not later deleted, it was the matter in the fourth paragraph from the end of the final text—that concluding with Palafox, which would in manuscript make about a folio sheet.

The date of composition of the last three paragraphs of the tract as printed, is hard to fix positively. At first sight these would appear to be the conclusion before which on February 28 was to be inserted the Palafox paragraph just indicated. But confusion is caused by Wordsworth's letters of March 27 (see below, note 42) and 29. In the former (LWF 1.407), Wordsworth wrote De Quincey, "As to concluding with a quotation, I don't know how to get over that; it could not conclude with the paragraph before, the simile not being sufficiently upon a level with ordinary imagination. Does what you will now find added require an alteration in the first words of the last paragraph?" The quotation is apparently one or both of those in the last two paragraphs of the final draft. The "simile" is apparently that in the third paragraph from the end. But in this same letter (LWF 1.410), he writes, "N. B. If Austria should not appear to join in the war, the two last paragraphs will require a slight alteration, an 'if' or something that you can easily give." These two last paragraphs are evidently the fifth and the fourth (the Palafox) from the end of the final draft. Again, on the 29th (LWF 1.404 ¶ 1), he says, "The concluding paragraph need not be altered on account of Palafox's reported death." This is the fourth paragraph from the end of the final draft. Hence, on March 27, Wordsworth was thinking of the Palafox paragraph as the concluding one, while in the same letter he assumed an end consisting of a "simile" paragraph followed by some quotation. His remark about smoothing the connections suggests that here, as at other times, he had not by him, and perhaps could not find, the passages in question. He put the burden of settling the matter on the "orderly" De Quincey. Of course, the confusion at this point may be due partly to a misplacing by Knight of the N. B. passage in the letter of the 27th. The passage *may*, with what follows it, belong to another letter.⁴¹

⁴¹ Compare the difference in locating parts of letters in LWF 1. 448, 449, 454-5, and LLP 344, 348, 350, 351. See note 86.

Dorothy concluded her letter of February 28, "I hope your troubles and perplexities in this affair will end with this." But, apparently, the greatest difficulties were to follow. So far as I can find, there have been published no letters of the Wordsworths or De Quincey between this letter and the group of March 26 and the days thereafter (to De Quincey, LWF Nos. 184, 188, 189, 187; to Wrangham, LWF No. 196; to Poole, Knight's *Life of Wordsworth* 2.134; to Stuart, LLP 333, LWF No. 190). The text of this group of letters shows, however, that a number of letters were exchanged during the month's interval. Of a set of "four letters sent off together" (LWF 1.398 ¶ 3) before the 27th (see note 49), at least one (that containing the "couple of sentences"), and probably all, must be missing.

We have seen that Stuart had much trouble with Wordsworth's "copy" for the *Courier*. The group of letters enumerated shows that many changes must have been made by the author before March 26, necessitating queries by De Quincey. Just how important and numerous these modifications were, we cannot determine in the absence of letters from February 28 to March 26.

During this period, however, an extensive and significant insertion was conceived of and completed. On March 27,⁴² Wordsworth apologized to De Quincey for not sending "copy" sooner. "I have been long in sending the rest," he continued, "because I thought by straining a point I might be able to say in the present publication all that was necessary. Accordingly, I wrote a great deal, but I have been obliged to give up the plan, and send what you will find, suppressing as much as I have sent. In fact I was exhausted in bodily strength. As the Duke of York's business is over, there is now a fair opening for a little of the public attention. Besides, I was very uneasy at the thought of detaining you in London."

⁴² LWF 1. 405, No. 188, headed by Knight, "Postmark, [March 30th, 1809.]" Here (409 ¶ 1) is the first mention of "a passage" in the *Moniteur*. This shows that the letter precedes No. 189, which refers (413 ¶ 4) to "the passage" in the *Moniteur*. The Postscript of No. 189 is dated "Tuesday"—i. e., March 28. No. 188 also bids (406 ¶ 1) cancel the page with the [Saragossa] footnote. No. 187, dated March 29, follows this, for it mentions "the page which you will have been obliged to cancel with the footnote" (404 ¶ 1). The opening passages of the two show that this letter (188) follows No. 184, which is of March 26 and 27 (see below, note 45). It is, then, evident that it is to be dated March 27.

The facts become more clear from Wordsworth's letter (LLP 333-4) to Stuart, written March 26, and, according to LLP, "Posted March 31, 1809":

"Yesterday I sent off the last sheets of the pamphlet.⁴⁴ I have entitled it 'Concerning the Relations of Great Britain, Spain, and Portugal, to each other and to the Common Enemy at this crisis, and specifically as affected by the Convention of Cintra; the whole brought to the test of those principles, &c.' As I found the *public mind* so completely engrossed with the Duke of York, I thought it better to avail myself of that opportunity to add general matter to the pamphlet, concerning the hopes of the Spaniards and principles of the contest; so that, from the proportion of Spain which it occupied in the work, the Convention of Cintra might fairly appear, what in truth it is in my mind, an action dwelt upon only for the sake of illustrating principles, with a view to promote liberty and good policy; in the manner in which an anatomist illustrates the laws of organic life from a human subject before him and his audience."

The situation is pretty clear. Wordsworth had been contemplating another pamphlet to be published as a "second part." Soon after sending off the "conclusion" at the end of February, reluctant to let the tract stand, he caught at the idea of the public's preoccupation with the Duke of York scandal,⁴⁴ and notified De Quincey that he would add a long insertion. Through this addition he hoped to present adequately the larger views that he had intended from the beginning to present (see letter of December 3), but the fuller development of which he had determined to leave largely to the "second part." Until the last week of March, he labored on this insertion with the passion that accompanied all his literary efforts. This extended application produced the usual suffering and exhaustion. His sense of the need for a timely appearance of the pamphlet revived. The public interest in the Duke's case was abating. De Quincey was waiting in London with a patience that begot lively self-accusation in the author, and probably aroused the

"As the "copy" went off on March 25 (see note 45), this letter was written on the 26th.

"Mary Anne Clarke, mistress of the Duke of York, Commander-in-chief of the British Army, had obtained money from officers on promise of her influence toward their advancement. On January 27, 1809, Colonel Wardle brought the matter before the Commons. A committee investigated the case. The Duke was shown not to be guilty of actually corrupt practices, but he resigned his office on March 18. The affair filled the prints, and "raised a cloud of pamphlets." See *D. N. B.*, 20. 234-5, 10. 436-7; *State Trials*, 29. 550.

remonstrances of the household. Hopeless of doing all that he saw to be done, Wordsworth selected and fitted together about half of what he had composed for the insertion, and, on Saturday, March 25,⁴⁵ sent off the "copy." Discouraged, he wrote De Quincey, "The title-page need not state 'first part.' I do not wish to engage myself so far, having now said so much."⁴⁶

The four published letters to De Quincey enable us to identify the insertion as it stands in the printed text. On March 27 (see note 42), Wordsworth writes (LWF 1.406), "The great body of additions made, since the conclusion was sent [*i. e.*, in February, see above, page 35], will begin in this manner, after some expression like this which I cannot recollect, 'administered as the old Monarchy of Spain.'" He continues in a new paragraph, "But I began with hope, and hope goes along with me. 'In Madrid, in Ferrol,' etc. I cannot find the passage in my MS. Therefore if anything be wanting to smooth the junction, you will be so kind as to add it. . . . The first direction given⁴⁷ for the insertions is therefore set aside; it would indeed there have been quite out of its place, so near the conclusion. Any expressions [evidently in the part preceding the insertion] which lead the reader to expect the conclusion too soon, such as 'parting look,' etc., etc., you will of course omit."⁴⁸

⁴⁵See LWF 1. 390, No. 184. Knight mislocates this letter, but suggests (following Mr. Gordon Wordsworth) that it may not have been written till February, 1809. The postscript is dated "Monday morning." The opening two lines of the letter show that it belongs to the same period as Letters 187, 188, 189, 196, and LLP 333—*i. e.*, the last days of March. At 391 ¶ 3 Wordsworth asks De Quincey to inquire whether Stuart approves of printing the Convention and the Armistice in the Appendix. In No. 187 (399 l. 1) he tells him that Stuart has approved of the printing of the documents. Letter No. 187 is dated "Wed. Evening, 29th March." Hence the Monday postscript of No. 184 was written March 27, and the body of the letter on Sunday, March 26. The "last sheet," "sent off yesterday," was sent on Saturday, March 25.

⁴⁶LWF 1. 410 end. But the printed tract shows in the midst of the insertion that he held till a late date the idea of another part: "Upon a future occasion (if what has been now said meets with attention) I shall point out the steps by which the practice of life may be lifted up towards these high precepts" (1809, 186 ¶ 4; G, 170 ¶ 4; K, 273 ¶ 4; Oxf, 189 ¶ 2). See also the fifth sentence of the paragraph next following that just quoted from.

⁴⁷Evidently in one of the missing letters.

⁴⁸De Quincey did delete such expressions save two (see note 46).

"Does what you will now find added require an alteration in the first words of the last paragraph? I ask this question because I cannot find the MS." On the 29th (LWF 1.398 ¶ 2), fearful that his "bad penmanship may have rendered the direction unintelligible," he gives the same location for the insertion. "In Madrid" is "to be preceded by a couple of sentences" already forwarded "in the last of the four letters [see above, page 37] sent off together."

The long insertion opened, then, with "But I began with hope . . ." (1809, 156 ¶ 2; G, 148 ¶ 2; K, 246 ¶ 2; Oxf, 157 ¶ 2). The "sentences" referred to are the first sentences of this paragraph. The letter containing them is missing.⁴⁹ The long insertion appears to have concluded at farthest with the end of 1809, 188 ¶ 1; G, 171 ¶ 2; K, 274 ¶ 1; Oxf, 190 ¶ 1. The paragraph following this is the fifth from the end of the printed tract.⁵⁰ It begins, "I have announced the feelings of those who hope, . . ."; and ends, ". . . the other begin a career in the fulness of her joy." This was in De Quincey's hands when Dorothy wrote him on February 28 (LWF 1.398; see above, page 35), ". . . stop the Press at the words 'career in the fulness of—.' The addition will be about a folio sheet."

This paragraph and its beginning as it stands in the final text, fit on well to the last two⁵¹ paragraphs (beginning, 1809, 154 ¶ 1; G, 146 ¶ 2; K, 244 ¶ 2; Oxf, 155 ¶ 2)—indeed, rather to the last four paragraphs⁵² (beginning, 1809, 150 ¶ 2; G, 144 ¶ 2; K,

⁴⁹ As the first of the "couple of sentences" is quoted in the letter of the 27th, the "four letters" were sent before that date. The "couple of sentences" are not the two quoted for insertion in LWF 1.412 last ¶. These latter two were to be inserted at 1809, 166 l. 6; G, 155 l. 16; K, 255 l. 13; Oxf, 167 last line.

⁵⁰ On the date of the last four paragraphs, see above, page 36.

⁵¹ The former of these paragraphs should be read for an example of the numerous parallels citable for the famous end of Lincoln's *Gettysburg Address*.

⁵² The earliest of these four paragraphs has the passage, "This moment (while I am drawing towards a conclusion) I learn, from the newspaper reports, that the House of Commons has refused to declare that the Convention of Cintra disappointed the hopes and expectations of the nation." The next paragraph discusses this motion, and ends with the transition to the "brighter region" of "hopes." These two paragraphs were written a few days after the rejection by the Commons on February 21 (see *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1809, April, l. 354-5) of the motion in question. They were evidently sent to De Quincey with the "conclusion" to arrive in London on February 25 (see above, page 35).

241 ¶ 2; Oxf, 152 ¶ 2)—of the passage preceding the long insertion. Confirmation of the point indicated as the conclusion of the insertion, is afforded in the passages (1809, 179 ¶ 2, 180 ¶ 2; 165 ¶ 2, 3; K, 267 ¶¶ 2, 3; Oxf, 181 ¶ 2, 182 ¶ 2) on the two sieges of Saragossa. The second siege began on December 20, 1808. On January 27, 1809, the invaders entered the city, but were fought from house to house till capitulation was forced on February 20.⁵³ Wordsworth is clearly writing well after the news of the house-to-house fighting and the capitulation—indeed, his phrase “after another resistance of nearly three months” suggests that he was here writing well toward the middle of March at earliest. The letter of March 27 (LWF 1.406 ll. 3, 9) shows that the matter on the two sieges had just been sent to De Quincey. But the whole body of the insertion, as we have defined it, is a unit in its thought as well as in the links of its expression.

The long insertion made up, then, thirty-two pages, or one-sixth, of the printed text of 1809. The passage is one of the finest in the book. Its passionate glorification of the Spanish resistance as an embodiment of the unconquerable and ever to be revered spirit of right, of freedom, and of national independence, indeed accomplishes the purpose that the poet defined to Stuart, raising the reader from the lower grounds of debate on the Convention to the heights and larger prospects of exalted political and moral power and vision. Of this success Henry Crabb Robinson showed immediate evidence when, in his review of the book, he gave such high praise particularly to the latter part of the pamphlet.⁵⁴ More striking evidence of the importance of this passage for the tract itself and for the history of political philosophy, is afforded in Professor Dicey's article and book on the statesmanship of Wordsworth. These point out the vital import of Wordsworth's political views in the Great War, and declare that the successes and the failures of English foreign policy during the nineteenth century are practically coincident with adoption and rejection of these views, which are chiefly formulated in the Cintra pamphlet. Apparently unaware of the long insertion as such, Professor Dicey has paraphrased and quoted certain passages of the tract as funda-

⁵³ *Ency. Brit.*, 11th Edit., s. v., *Saragossa*; Napier, *Hist. of the Peninsular War*, Bk. 5, Ch. 2.

⁵⁴ *London Review*, 1809, 2. 250 ff.

mental to the exposition of these views. All of these,⁸⁵ except three of minor extent, are in the long insertion.

By delaying the publication for some weeks, the insertion contributed to the failure of the tract with the public; and so, to the ruin of the plan for the second pamphlet. We have seen that the insertion was about half of what Wordsworth had actually written in a hurried attempt to express the underlying conceptions of the second part. Had that work appeared, then, it would have been an impassioned formulation and advocacy of large and essential principles, finding their practical embodiment in the national independence of each people, and their bases in the fundamental constitution and needs of human nature. What a tremendous enunciation of vital moral and political truth would have been the fruit of the stress and the incitement of the composition of this second work!

Though no mention of the fact is made in the printed correspondence, the shift in emphasis in the tract that we have just seen, led Wordsworth to send to De Quincey directions for a title-page to displace one already set up. This new title-page was probably that ("less a Title than a Table of Contents," wrote Wordsworth to Wrangham, LWF 1.427) of the tract as published: "Concerning / The Relations / of / Great Britain, / Spain, and Portugal, / to each other, and to the common enemy, / at this crisis; / and specifically as affected by / the / Convention of Cintra; / *The whole brought to the test of those Principles, by which / alone the Independence and Freedom of Nations / can be Preserved or Recovered.* / Qui didicit patriæ quid debeat;— / Quod sit conscripti, quod iudicis officium; quæ / Partes in bellum missi ducis. / By William Wordsworth. / London: / Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, / Paternoster-row. / 1809."

In 1916, Thomas J. Wise announced his possession of a copy of the pamphlet with the following title-page: "Concerning / the / Convention of Cintra, / in relation to / The Principles by which the Independence of / Nations must be Preserved or Recovered. /

⁸⁵ Dicey, *Statesmanship of Wordsworth*, Oxford, 1917, 81, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, quoting and paraphrasing the tract of 1809, 165 ¶ 2-168 ¶ 2; 166 ll. 6-12, 166 l. 2 from end to end of ¶; 154 ¶ 1 ll. 5 ff., 160 ¶ 2 s. 2; 169-70; 113-15, 148 ll. 21-29; 162; 162, 163, 166-68. As these references can be used only with Professor Dicey's text, the pages in the reprints are not given.

London: / Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme. / Paternoster Row. / 1809.”⁵⁶ Mr. Wise printed a reduced photographic facsimile of this page. He stated that he knew of only one other copy, which was shown him by a London bookseller in the summer of 1915. Mr. Wise has informed me that the bookseller is Dobell, and has identified my unique De Quincey copy (see below, page 68), purchased of Dobell in 1915, as the one containing the second copy of the rejected title.

Comparison of this title-page with the other titles given in the correspondence, and with that of the final issue (see pages 23, 26-7, 38, 42; and below, page 48) enables one to locate it in the series. It agrees closest with the heading of the first *Courier* article (see above, page 26). It clearly antedates the title quoted in the correspondence of March 26-April 3 (see below, page 48). That Wordsworth quoted so much of the final title to Stuart on the 26th (LLP 333), indicates that the change was very recent, and had not been known to Stuart. The shift in emphasis in the tract produced by the long insertion sent off on March 25, is just what would produce a change in title such as took place between the earlier printed page and the title finally published. The presence of the rejected page in at least two copies of the tract, also shows that the change was late. My copy of this title is inserted before the substituted final title. It is stabbed, just as are the other leaves of the various copies of the tract.⁵⁷ Further, directions for the new title were given probably in one of the set of four missing letters sent off together just before March 27 (see note 49). On March 27 (LWF 1.410), Wordsworth remarked to De Quincey, “The title-page need not state ‘first part.’” Again, Dorothy’s letter of Sunday, April 9 (LWF 1.420) implies that at that time the poet had been agitatedly discussing whether or not De Quincey would be printing “Author of the L. B.” on the title-page. All of this confirms the view that the final title was substituted at about the time the long insertion was sent to London, or at least not long before that time.

It is interesting to imagine the state of mind of De Quincey on

⁵⁶ *Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of William Wordsworth*, London. Printed for Private Circulation Only by Richard Clay & Sons, Ltd., 1916, 72.

⁵⁷ Wise, *Bibliography*, 75.

the receipt of the long insertion of March 25 and the series of letters, with their many commissions, that followed close upon it. He was evidently in the midst of the press-work with a printing office more or less exasperated by delays and alterations, himself distressed by many difficulties in the work, and agitated with anticipations of new modifications sure to come from Allan Bank. Moreover, he had been suffering from toothache and other physical afflictions (LWF 1.454 l. 4, *et al.*) that had long tormented him, and that were preparing for the agonies of the later years. To his natural zeal for accuracy and for perfection of form, was added the ardent anxiety of a young man to satisfy the demands of the older friend whom he so admired. The "copy" was not good, the writing was sometimes hard to make out, the punctuation was irregular and defective, the expression occasionally broke off in the midst. It was his office to make all this good. On his own initiative he was, at need, to coördinate the matter, to fill in minor gaps, to supply missing connectives, to smoothe out irregular transitions, and to fit in the numerous alterations promiscuously sent by the author without adequate indications for identification, often with deficient knowledge of the context, and with an ignoring of the practical conditions of printing. Before De Quincey left Grasmere, it had evidently been agreed that he should add in an appendix such notes as seemed in his judgment desirable. All this he was expected to do with great speed. His position was not enviable. The poet's minimizing of minor matters like spelling (LWF 1.398 ¶ 3), his knowledge of the author, as well as his own inclination, forbade him to take seriously. Though the letters are missing, it is but fair to assume—indeed, the indications in the extant letters of queries and changes by De Quincey prove it—that the mails had brought him during the first weeks of March many corrections made hit or miss through the various parts of the text in his hands. Now came a cycle of letters, each with a number of modifications. The four letters extant from March 26-31, comprise a total of eighteen pages in print. The missing four could not have been brief.

The conditions that have been indicated; the confusion of the poet's papers at Allan Bank; his constant weighing of phrase and idea as he pondered, now here, now there, the scattered leaves; his insertions and modifications of minute particulars of thought

and expression; and his unconsciousness of the labors that he was imposing on De Quincey—all these are evident to the reader of the letters of the last days of March. The difficulties in making alterations in handwritten “copy” from directions sent by mail, are great in themselves. But, just as Dorothy on February 28 held it sufficient to say that her brother is “making an insertion in one paragraph,” and to add in a postscript, “. . . *stop the Press* at the words ‘career in the fulness of—’”, so these later letters exhibit Wordsworth’s practice of ordering changes with still more meagre directions for identification—often, indeed, adjoining without separation corrections to be distinguished only by slight catch-phrases in passages quite isolated in thought, and tens of pages apart from each other.⁵⁸ At times the poet did not know just what he had written;⁵⁹ he could not find in his own manuscript at Allan Bank the passage in question—as when he declared, “I cannot find the passage in my MS.”; and, again, “I cannot find the MS.”⁶⁰ De Quincey’s admiration must have been put to it to enable him to be patient with a practice that the author at least once (LWF 1.408) admitted: “I am obliged to put things down just as they come into my memory; but, as I know your habits of order, I can trust to you for correcting this.” Add to all this the fact that, as Wordsworth once declared, frequently the poet’s “bad penmanship may have rendered the direction unintelligible” (LWF 1.398; see also 1.446); and that the manuscript was written by at least three persons. Well might the author apologize (LWF 1.406), “I am afraid you will have had endless trouble about the alterations, small and great,” and declare (LWF 1.446), even though grudgingly and out of a forced politeness, of the printing, “. . . indeed I am surprised how you have been able to get it done so correctly.” However familiar De Quincey was with the “copy” and the writing, he must have had many unnecessary distresses that can be appreciated only by one who has been trying (as has the present writer) to track down the extant corrections by means of a text that is in print.

⁵⁸ *E. g.*, LWF 1. 404 ¶ 1, 406-410, 412-3.

⁵⁹ *E. g.*, LWF 1. 391, 399, 406 ¶¶ 2-3, 407 ¶ 1, 408 ¶ 2 end, 409 ¶ 2, 417 near end, 423 ¶ 4; LLP 342, 344, misquotation (see below, page 53), in vital passages.

⁶⁰ LWF 1. 406-7. See also Coleridge’s statements, LLP 155 ¶2, 157 top.

It may be of interest, and perhaps of importance ultimately, to indicate and locate the alterations ordered in these four letters. A reading of the correspondence at the points noted will afford illustrations of the statements that have just been made.

On March 26 (see note 45), the day after the posting of the long insertion, were sent (LWF 1.390) two minor changes (1809, 184 ll. 12 ff., 187 ll. 13 ff.; G, 168 ll. 5 from end ff., 171 ll. 6-8; K, 271 ll. 15 ff., 274 ll. 2 ff.; Oxf, 186 ll. 18 ff., 189 l. 20). The former of these did not finally appear as suggested.

On the 27th (see note 42), the poet directed (LWF 1.405 ¶ 2) the cancellation of a page with a footnote on Saragossa prepared by De Quincey partly to show that the passage in question was composed long after the earlier part of the tract. Then followed a suggestion (406 ¶ 4) of a note in the Appendix on the bulletin of the French on Saragossa. A query succeeds (406 ¶ 2) as to material which De Quincey actually incorporated in Appendix D of the tract; and another change, which I cannot locate, is ordered. There come next directions (406 ¶¶ 2, 3; evidently because of obscurity in earlier directions) for the proper location of the long insertion, with a suggestion that De Quincey modify the context to make it conform with the insertion; the poet cannot give accurate directions because he cannot find his MS. Then follows a request (407 ¶ 1) that De Quincey write a note for the Appendix (done in Appendix E) after looking up a passage in a copy of the *Courier* that the poet cannot find or identify. The author also wishes (407 ¶ 1) his friend to verify all the quotations forwarded for use in Appendix A. He sends (407 ¶ 2) for the "Advertisement" a passage that De Quincey incorporated as the third paragraph, only substituting "changes" for "a change." Then follow two more slight modifications (1809, 133 ll. 14-5, 167 l. 11; G, 131 ll. 14 ff., 156 l. 10; K, 226 l. 20, 256 l. 12; Oxf, 134 l. 29, 169 l. 4). He next proposes (408 ¶ 4) the preparation of a note making clear his favorable impression of General Ferguson's conduct (1809, 142 note; G, 138 note; K, 234 note; Oxf, 143 note), reverting again to the note on the French bulletin at length. He adds (410 ¶ 4) a possible change (1809, 188 ¶ 2, 189 ¶ 2; G, 171 ¶ 2, 172 ¶ 2; K, 274 ¶ 2, 275 ¶ 2; Oxf, 190 ¶ 2, 191 ¶ 2) in case Austria does not join in the war; and gives directions that the title-page "need not state 'first part.'" To all this he adds

suggestions as to the distribution of copies of the pamphlet to various persons. Stuart must be consulted. The letter "is a miserable jumble, and my head a perfect chaos." Will not De Quincey "contrive to inspirit" a note that he sends? To all these follows a postscript relieving De Quincey of a previous commission to call for a certain poem, for it is come. But there are directions to send a copy of the tract to Monkhouse, and one to the author of the *Narrative of the Siege of Saragossa*, in hope that he may get a part of the pamphlet translated into Spanish.

Was it accident, or was it her knowledge of the dispiriting contents of this letter, that caused "Your ever-affectionate Dorothy Wordsworth" to add a postscript beginning and ending, "My dear friend," and having for its body only a few lines about the recovery from measles of Thomas and the baby Catherine, who, as De Quincey later declared, was to him "an impersonation of the dawn and the spirit of infancy"?⁶¹

On the next day, March 28th,⁶² "not a little jeered" by his family, Wordsworth sends four more changes (1809, 166 l. 5, 178 l. 13, 179 l. 5, 179 l. 12; G, 155 l. 16, 164 l. 18, 165 l. 1, 165 l. 6; K, 255 l. 12, 266 l. 6, 266 l. 32, 266 last l.; Oxf, 167 last l., 180 l. 17, 181 l. 9, 181 l. 16); and begs De Quincey to "mend that stupid part of the note" on the French bulletin sent on the 27th.

On the 29th, with Miss Hutchinson as amanuensis, he sends a very long letter (LWF 1.398) again giving directions (398 ¶ 3) for the location of the long insertion—for his "bad penmanship may have rendered the direction unintelligible." He bids De Quincey print the Armistice and the Convention in the Appendix, having learned of Stuart's approval, which he had asked (LWF 1.391) De Quincey to inquire about. He now withdraws (399 ¶ 1) all the proposed note on the French bulletin, but suggests that De Quincey may well write something about it. He proposes (400 ¶ 2) that De Quincey write a long note (for which he offers suggestions and an extended comment) on the letters of Sir John Moore (see pamphlet, *Postscript on Sir John Moore's*

⁶¹ Masson ed., *Collected Writings*, Edinburgh, 1889, 2. 443.

⁶² LWF 1. 412, No. 189, posted March 31, 1809. I have shown that this letter follows No. 184, which is of March 26-27 (see note 45). Its postscript, dated "Tuesday Noon," was written, then, Tuesday, March 28, and its body perhaps on the 27th.

Letters). Since he has seen but four of these, he cannot himself write the note. He suggests (404 ¶ 1) that the cancelled Saragossa footnote (see above) be displaced by a footnote of "two words"—i. e., "written in January" (actually entered "Written in February"—1809, 120; G, 121; K, 214; Oxf, 121).

Wordsworth would seem to have been sufficiently occupied with all this matter. But in the midst of the revision, he undertook to circulate news of the pamphlet by correspondence with friends. He had already given directions to De Quincey and Stuart for sending copies to several persons of eminence likely to be interested. "A day or two" after March 25th⁶³ (see note 45), he writes to Wrangham of the approaching publication, of his fears that the tract will not be read, and of his assurance that if read it will do "some good," though he is aware it will create him "a world of enemies, and call forth the old yell of Jacobinism." He quotes the title of the pamphlet: "*Concerning the Relations of Great Britain, Spain, and Portugal, to each other, and to the common Enemy, at this crisis, and specifically as affected by the Convention of Cintra; the whole brought to the test of those Principles by which alone the Independence and Freedom of Nations can be Preserved or Recovered.*" To Poole he writes⁶⁴ on March 30 that he has expected no pecuniary profit from the book—"but for truth's sake and liberty's I should be happy to receive any observations or elucidations which it may suggest to you." Knight says this letter has the "long title," but he does not print the title. To Stuart Wordsworth wrote (LLP 333) the day (March 26) after sending the long insertion. After quoting as far as "Principles, &c.," the title he gave to Wrangham, he mentions the reasons for the long delay in getting off "copy." "I confess I have no hopes of the thing making any impression. The style of thinking and feeling is so little in the spirit of the age." And he urges Stuart to develop any opening for having at least parts of the tract translated into Spanish (see also LWF 1.411 ¶ 2). Will not Stuart go over the proofs for "any error, either as to fact or reasoning, that can be obviated or apologized for . . . by preface,

⁶³ LWF 1. 426, dated by Knight "(April, 1809)." The *Memoirs* (1. 388) and Grosart (3. 257) print the whole letter, dating it, "Workington, April 3, 1809."

⁶⁴ Knight, *Life of Wordsworth*, 2. 134.

note, or erratum"? These three letters when printed make up ten pages.

Having now got off the "copy," Wordsworth had little to do but await with growing impatience the issue of the book. In a letter (LWF 1.455) to Poole of May 31 (see note 87), he stated that, at the date of his letter of March 30, "a hundred pages were printed off." With little realization of the conditions, he was expecting the pamphlet to appear "in less than a fortnight" (LWF 1.427 l. 1; *Knight Life* 2.134).

Besides that to Wrangham (see above), but four letters of April are printed—three to De Quincey, and one to Stuart. Dorothy's letter of the 5th (LWF 1.416) reveals her in all her warm devotion. She has been working hard at the "dear cottage," full with passionate memories of the years there with her brother, to prepare his new home for De Quincey. She has been doing her best to quiet the well-meant apprehensions of Mrs. Kelsall of Manchester, who has been "plaguing" her and De Quincey with admonitions regarding the use of the materials for the cottage that she has been sending on. She has been reading at the sheaf of dull pamphlets that De Quincey has forwarded, and is quite impatient with the Klopstock *Letters*, evidently from the same parcel. And, with kind thoughtfulness, she has been suppressing the promise that the generous De Quincey has just made of a new carriage for John, which is to follow the gift of children's books recently received as a delightful addition to the numbers already sent on by their friend.⁶⁵ But all of this warm and kind letter is really to salve a hurt of De Quincey. Three letters have just come from him, with inquiries, among others, concerning several strange lapses in the "copy." But the great trouble is the distress of the sensitive editor because of Wordsworth's remarks in rejecting the note on Saragossa.⁶⁶ William is absent from home; but earnestly Dorothy assures De Quincey that her brother's expression must surely have been due to haste or negligence, and certainly not to intent or lack of confidence. It is quite obvious that, as in the case of other alterations, she has but little sympathy with the poet's

⁶⁵ The letters indicate that De Quincey was steadily sending, or offering to send, gifts to the children—LWF 1. 418, 420, 435, 472.

⁶⁶ The letter with this matter is perhaps missing, though it may be LWF 1. 405 ¶ 2.

boggling over unimportant small details. "Oh, how I shall rejoice for your sake, and for the sake of your poor head and eyes, when the pamphlet is fairly published! Till then I cannot be easy, for I shall never feel sure that William will not have some changes to make."

It is very evident that De Quincey had expressed with feeling his disturbance regarding the cancellation of the note, which had necessitated cancellation of a sheet (LWF 1.417 l. 5); and had shown distress from Wordsworth's manner in his letter, and his seeming injustice to De Quincey's views on the theme in question. That the poet was impatient over the remonstrance, and quite assured of De Quincey's unreasonableness, is shown in the extended, but rather stiff, explanation and expression of sympathy in the matter that he wrote De Quincey on Friday, April 7 (LWF 1.421). This inference is borne out by his delay of two days⁶⁷ before making the reply. He now explains rather carefully why he wishes a new correction—the omission of the word "Corunna."

Something of the poet's state of mind is to be gathered from Dorothy's letter of Sunday, April 9⁶⁸ (LWF 1.420). He had evidently been disturbed over the possibility that De Quincey had not got the title-page right, and would also bungle the "Corunna." It is fair to imagine that Dorothy, and perhaps Mary also, had been urging him to let the matter be—fearful of more trials for De Quincey, and possibly of the poet's writing something that would further disturb the sensitive editor. Dorothy takes the matter into her hands, in her own name tactfully conveying the message, and, without direct criticism of her brother, letting her sympathy with De Quincey appear. ". . . I think it best to write a few lines for your satisfaction, though whether the pamphlet be published or not, there is no *necessity* for writing, as I do not think it likely that you would have 'Author of the L. B.,' printed in the title-page, which must by no means be done. My brother

⁶⁷ He was away on a visit to Penrith and Workington from Friday, March 31, to Wednesday, April 5 (LWF 1. 421 ¶ 3; *Memoirs* 1. 388).

⁶⁸ Headed "Sunday Afternoon, April, 1809." Sunday was the 9th. The references to Coleridge's visit to Workington Hall (417, 421) indicate that the letter follows that of Wednesday, the 5th. It also follows Wordsworth's letter (LWF 1. 421) of Friday, the 7th, for it shows the poet has been at home—and he returned Wednesday. The directions for "Corunna" (420 ¶ 1, 424) show the same.

approves of your manner of disposing of General Ferguson. Let the 'Corunna' be omitted. I fear your labours will not be over to-morrow; but soon you must have rest, and we shall all be thankful. You have indeed been a treasure to us while you have been in London, having spared my brother so much anxiety and care. We are very grateful for your kindness." It is clear that at Allan Bank they were expecting the printing to be done within a few days.

With this, Wordsworth seems to have given up changing the text. Evidently, from now on, his irritation with his editor grew as the days passed. Apparently, little was written to De Quincey in the next weeks, for on the 28th there came a letter from him regretting that he had not heard from the family "for so long a time" (LWF 1.430). With the workmen again about the house trying to correct the defective chimneys, Wordsworth went back to poetry, which he had abandoned for some months. He set himself successfully to perfecting the *White Doe* for publication the next winter (LWF 1.430-1). Despite these efforts, and Coleridge's assistance in 1808 with corrections,⁶⁹ the poem was not issued till 1815. He was planning also to publish *Peter Bell* and *The Waggoner*, really not to appear till ten years later. He had been talking, and indeed had written to Coleridge, of taking up newspaper work to add to the family purse;⁷⁰ but Coleridge has sent an earnest protest—he can earn enough for them all!

The calm is, however, only on the surface. The pamphlet had not yet appeared. In the last days of April, Wordsworth was exchanging with Coleridge letters of complaint accusing De Quincey of grave delinquency (LLP 155). On the 26th, he asked Stuart (LLP 338) personally to interfere and urge the printer to activity. Stuart evidently saw Baldwin, who appears to have put the blame on De Quincey and the many corrections made (LLP 157 ll. 13 ff.). Coleridge's letter to Stuart of May 2 (LLP 155) opens up the whole matter. De Quincey has written Wordsworth that "the compositor has been drunk"⁷¹ ever since Easter week," absenting himself from the office, and, when present, setting up the matter so badly as to omit "whole sentences"; and

⁶⁹ Knight, *Life*, 2. 100; Campbell, *Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge*, London, 1901, lxxvii ¶ 1.

⁷⁰ On this, see note 32.

⁷¹ See also LLP 338.

Baldwin would not put another man on the job. Coleridge has been making inquiries (LLP 343 ¶ 2). Baldwin complains of "chopping and changing."⁷² De Quincey and Wordsworth declare that "for these last five weeks"⁷³ there has not been the slightest alteration made either in the text or the notes; nor a word altered in the proofs when returned, and only the punctuation in six places!!" But Coleridge is sceptical. He has written Wordsworth twice, very plainly stating that the printer is little to blame. Before De Quincey was given the supervision of the printing, he had seen too much of his "turn of mind, anxious yet dilatory, confused from over accuracy, and at once systematic and labyrinthine, not fully to understand how great a plague he might easily be to a London printer; his natural tediousness made yet greater by his zeal and fear of not discharging his trust; and superadded to Wordsworth's own Sibyl's leaves, blown about by the changeful winds of an anxious author's second thoughts." It is indeed pleasing to hear Coleridge so discourse! "I have written to W. stating honestly my convictions, that he will not find Baldwin so much in the wrong as he now believes, and that he ought to bring before his fancy all his own *copy*, from the beginning of the Work, and compare it in his mind's eye, with the sort of copy, and the mode of receiving it to which Baldwin had probably been accustomed." "That Wordsworth has not been quite pleased with the first letter, and will be still less so with my letter of to-day, I know; . . . not easily to admit oneself to be in fault, is as often the mark of a valuable, as of an obstinate mind." De Quincey is intolerably slow at any work. ". . . I can never retract my expression of vexation and surprise, that W. should have entrusted anything to him, beyond the mere correction of the Proofs. But an unwise anxiety to let nothing escape, has been the rock on which W. has split; whereas had he brought it out, such as it was, he might now have been adding all he wished to a second edition. But so it is! We cannot be perfect." Coleridge himself is too indifferent in his printing. Wordsworth's "is a more rational fault, and linked to better qualities."

So the author, the editor, and the printer, were passing the blame from one to the other—all probably somewhat at fault, but

⁷²See also LLP 343.

⁷³See also Wordsworth to Stuart, LLP 345.

the author really the original culprit. A sufficient amount of time had elapsed, however, to make possible the remedying of all the fruits of the delinquencies. Evidently the pamphlet was actually at last about to appear.

But, alas! the author was once again to interfere seriously! On May 3, the very day on which, as De Quincey had notified him, the pamphlet was to be issued (LWF 3.469), Wordsworth chanced to read in "an old magazine" "that B. Flower had been fined £100, and committed to Newgate for four months" for a libel on the Bishop of Llandaff (LWF 3.468; LLP 341). "This brought Gilbert Wakefield to my mind, and his four years' imprisonment in Dorsetshire goal." The poet was filled with apprehension: he may have laid himself open to prosecution for the ardent phrases of the tract! He hastened to beseech Stuart,⁷⁴ if the pamphlet was not published, to go over it for passages that might be "made a handle for exercising upon my person a like act of injustice. If any such passages occur, let the leaf be cancelled." Expense is no consideration in such a matter. Let De Quincey or Stuart fill up the gaps that may be caused by any such excisions. The passage from which most is to be apprehended is "what greater punishment could befall men [*sic!* "what punishment could be greater"] than to have brought upon themselves the unreasonable [*sic!* "unremoveable"] contempt and hatred of their countrymen?" (1809, 97 l. 14; G, 104 l. 2 from end; K, 194 l. 8 from end; Oxf, 98 l. 9 from end).⁷⁵ Much of this matter, with added details of the original suggestion of his apprehensions, Wordsworth wrote to Coleridge in the important letter (LWF 4.468)⁷⁶ of the 5th,

"LLP 341. This letter was "Posted May 6, 1809." It was written May 3. Wordsworth expected Stuart to receive it on Saturday, May 6 (LWF 1. 445 ¶ 2), and looked for a reply by Wednesday, the 10th (LWF 1. 443).

"It would appear that the motto on the reverse of the title-page of the pamphlet, was a late thought. In this letter to Stuart, Wordsworth quotes (LLP 344) the passage from Bacon's "advertisement concerning Church Controversies." He comments, "Substitute the word Patriot for Christian and the position is equally true, and even more so, inasmuch as we are less liable to be misled about moral duties than points of doctrine." See below, page 56.

"The day before yesterday," Wordsworth was struck with the libel scare, and at once wrote to Stuart. That letter was posted May 6, but written May 3, the day of the scare. The letter to Coleridge, and that

outlining and explaining his scheme for the arrangement of his poems.

On the 5th,⁷⁷ Wordsworth wrote De Quincey of his request to Stuart, expressing his apprehensions, calling attention especially to the passage quoted above, and suggesting that for the passage be substituted the words, "What punishment could be greater than the unalterable sentence already passed on them by the voice of their countrymen?" or any words to that effect to fill up the space." To clinch the matter, he added a postscript, "If the pamphlet is bound up, the leaf must be cancelled."⁷⁸

Not having heard from either De Quincey or Stuart, he writes on the 10th (LWF 1.443)⁷⁹ a long letter to the former, insisting that Stuart "carefully cancel every leaf" that contains matter which he considers actionable. If he have any doubt, let him consult some reliable person. Wordsworth cares little what delay may be caused. One passage⁸⁰ that he has discussed with De Quincey, he fears has not been changed. There is "another strong passage"⁸¹ beginning, "In Sir Hew Dalrymple. . . ." Let Stuart use his judgment—but the "*hatred and contempt*" passage must be cancelled.

of May 5 to De Quincey (LWF 1. 440 l. 9), have other variations (probably misquotations) from the printed text of the dangerous passage, among them "*hatred and contempt*."

⁷⁷LWF 1. 440. Knight says the postscript to Sara Hutchinson's part of this letter is dated Friday, May 5, and the letter has the postmark "May 8, 1809." Why did he omit the date? Dorothy's letter to De Quincey of Saturday, May 6 (LWF 1. 435), mentions this letter as written by her brother and Miss Hutchinson "yesterday."

⁷⁸On the outcome of this, see below, pages 59, 76.

⁷⁹Dated "Wednesday Night." Printed by Japp (*De Quincey Memorials*, 1. 164) as written "a few days later" than the letter of the 5th. Wednesday is May 10. Wordsworth says he expected this night a reply from Stuart or De Quincey or both, apparently to his letters of the 3rd and 5th (see above); and states that Stuart should have received his "first letter" on the libel scare "last Saturday" (1. 445 ¶ 2).

⁸⁰"Now it was in the character. . ." (1809, 104; G, 109; K, 200; Oxf, 105). The passage had been changed (LLP 346), as Knight shows (LWF 1. 444 note). Japp (*De Quincey Memorials*, 1. 165 note) misquotes Grosart's text in remarking on this passage.

⁸¹Changed by adding "and their own weakness," and twice substituting "had" for "have" (1809, 54 l. 8; G, 73 l. 5 from end; K, 157 l. 22; Oxf, 55 l. 22). Japp (*op. cit.* 1. 165 note 2) inaccurately says the passage "stands as originally written."

Wordsworth was evidently in a state of high vocal alarm. The attitude of the women toward most of his alterations, that appears here and there⁸² in the correspondence of the preceding months, is apparent in these days of apprehension. To the letter of May 5, Sara Hutchinson added a postscript (LWF 1.442) beginning, "We females shall be very sorry to find that the pamphlet is not published, for we have not the least fear of Newgate—if there was a garden to walk in, we think we should do very nicely—and a gaol in the country would be quite pleasant. But seriously, I hope that the passage may not be deemed objectionable, for another delay will be most provoking, and put Mr. Baldwin out of all patience with you both." Dorothy's letter of the 6th (LWF 1.435) opens with a wish that the carrier bring them a letter from De Quincey that night. "Would that the pamphlets might come too! William still continues to haunt himself with fancies about Newgate and Dorchester or some other gaol, but as his mind clings to the gloomy, Newgate is his favorite theme. We, however, have no fears, for even if the words be actionable (which I cannot but think they are not), in these times they would not dare to inflict such a punishment."

Apparently only one change resulted from this libel scare. Arrangements were made that the leaf (1809, 97-98) containing the "unremovable contempt and hatred" passage (1809, 97 l. 14; G, 104 l. 2 from end; K, 194 l. 8 from end; Oxf, 98 l. 9 from end), should be removed, and another inserted with a variant ("what punishment could be greater than to have brought upon themselves the sentence passed upon them by the voice of their countrymen?") of the substitute that Wordsworth had proposed.⁸³ The correspondence of the next two weeks after the letter of May 19, is missing.

It seems that the printer finished his work by the 20th.⁸⁴ On the 23rd (LLP 344 ¶ 3; LWF 1.445 ¶ 4), Wordsworth received

⁸² *E. g.*, LWF 1. 412 ¶ 4 l. 1, 418 l. 6 ff., 420 ¶ 1.

⁸³ See below, page 59, for the failure to make the substitution in some copies.

⁸⁴ See LWF 1. 456 ¶ 2 ll. 6, 11, 457 l. 3; LLP 348. De Quincey appears to have determined the date appended to the "Advertisement," "May 20th, 1809," by the date on which the printer finished. It was well to hold the dating till the last moment. Still more changes might have been ordered from Grasmere.

four unstitched copies (LLP 351 ¶ 2) of the pamphlet. On the 24th (LWF 1.445), he wrote De Quincey a rather grudging letter in which he expresses appreciation of the postscript on Sir John Moore's letters. His apprehensions will not let him rest satisfied that the text has been gone over thoroughly enough to assure the removal of all actionable passages. Moreover, though he has not read the tract through, he is irritated to find already some *errata*. Of these the most important is "zeal" for "hate" in the motto prefaced to the pamphlet. Two others—"abuses" for "abusers" (1809, 186 l. 16; G, 170 l. 18; K, 273 l. 9; Oxf, 188 l. 22), and "calenture" for "calenture of fancy" (1809, 184 l. 7 from end; G, 169 l. 12; K, 271 l. 6 from end; Oxf, 187 l. 2)—are important. No doubt the fault rests with omissions or illegible penmanship in the "copy"; "indeed I am surprised how you have been able to get it done so correctly." But the errors are there, and he commissions Miss Hutchinson to draw up a list of twelve slips. He bids her ask De Quincey to send a copy of the book to Lord Lonsdale,⁸⁵ after correcting the errors with a pen.

The "error" in the motto—"character of zeal or love," for "character of hate or love"—which Wordsworth, "sadly grieved," declared (see second paragraph below), "utterly destroys the sole reason for presenting the passage so conspicuously to notice," is interesting. The prints of the original (see note 75) in Bacon's *An Advertisement Touching the Controversies of the Church of England* (paragraph 4 or 5, according to the text) usually read, "character of zeal or love" (*e.g.*, Montagu's edition, London, 1827, 7.32; edition printed by Baynes, London, 1824, 2.503). Spedding's *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, London, 1861, 1.76, reads, "character either of zeal or love"; but has a footnote, "either of hate or love: Harl. MS. 3795." In quoting to Stuart the original passage from Bacon (see note 75), Wordsworth wrote, "love or hate"! misquoting, as in the same letter he misquoted the "contempt and hatred" passage (LLP 344; see notes 75, 76, and the text thereto). The passage from Bacon that he had encountered with the Harleian reading so appealed to him that he determined to adopt a motto for the pamphlet, and to adopt this. He or his original omitted "either." Apparently,

⁸⁵ See also the letter to Lonsdale (LWF 3. 395; *Memoirs* 1. 390). On the *errata* list and the ink corrections, see below, pages 72, 74.

Mary or Dorothy copied the passage from another text; or, more probably, De Quincey looked it up in another edition, and changed the "copy." Knight prints, "hate or love," following the Hutchinson *errata* list. Grosart and the Oxford Press read, "zeal or love," for they ignore (see below, page 76) the Hutchinson *errata*.

On the 25th, Wordsworth voiced his feeling against De Quincey to Stuart.⁶⁶ He asserts that De Quincey has been the *occasion*, but not the *cause*, of the delay in publication. Not a syllable in the body of the work has been altered since nearly two months back. De Quincey "must have" insisted upon his punctuation being attended to; and the printer "must have" been put out of humor by this, and therefore refused to go on with the work. Wordsworth's only inducement in giving the supervision to De Quincey was a desire to save time and expense, and to spare Stuart—and he is very sorry that Stuart has been so bothered in the matter.

Chidden by Mrs. Wordsworth for his grudging letter of the 24th, on the 26th Wordsworth wrote De Quincey an epistle (LWF 1.451) intended to be more gracious. The coolness of the former letter arose, as he had replied to Mary, from his assumption that "Mr. De Quincey will do me the justice to believe that, as I knew he was completely master of the subject [Sir John Moore's letters], my expectations would be high; and if I told him that these were answered, what need I or could I say any more?" He compliments him on the handling of Moore's letters. He is "sadly grieved," however, about "that error" in the motto, which "utterly destroys the sole reason for presenting the passage so conspicuously to notice." He regrets that he did not order the pamphlet sent to him before its issue, for he might have been sure that there would be blunders in it. "In spite of all this it is very correctly printed, and the punctuation pleases me much; though there are here and there trifling errors in it. I think, indeed, your plan of punctuation admirable." Not satisfied with this doubtful expiation and attempt to placate, Mrs. Wordsworth found space

⁶⁶ LLP has two letters to Stuart, one of the 25th (344), and one posted May 31 (348). Knight prints parts of these letters. The selections from that of the 25th, he prints as two letters (LWF 1. 448, 449), with the second of these incorporating two paragraphs (LWF 1. 450 ¶¶ 3, 4) from the end of the letter posted on the 31st. I follow the LLP arrangement which appears to be the more authentic.

left on the sheet to write a much longer letter, whose matter and spirit would go far to smooth out the trouble.

Enough would seem to have occurred. But new cause for disturbance came several days later in a letter from De Quincey. The poet writes Stuart on the 30th or the 31st (LLP 1.348), "angered much" that De Quincey has trusted the printers to show the sheets to Stuart for a search for libellous passages—and they have gone ahead and finished the work without waiting! Wordsworth is offended at the possible injury to himself, and the offense to Stuart. One is tempted to suggest that probably Stuart had not been very anxious to undertake the unnecessary censoring of the long tract, with the inevitable dissatisfaction that would have resulted from excisions and substitutions and added costs of printing. Moreover, Wordsworth is angered that the work has been lying ten days at the printer's, and is probably still unpublished, because De Quincey did not determine when the books were finished, and then notify Stuart of the fact, but took the printer's word that he would convey the notification. Despite his consciousness that the tract will appear too late for any effect, the poet urges Stuart to push it forward in the public eye for the few days of the Session that remain; and he requests that, if a second edition is in publication when the letter reaches him, Stuart will cancel all passages he judges to be libellous.

Wordsworth found relief from his feelings by complaining of all this and more, at much length, with many details, in a letter to Poole on May 31.⁸⁷ The delay of the past two months is all

⁸⁷ LWF 1. 455. This is the important letter in which Wordsworth speaks out very bluntly his opinions of Coleridge's character and his prospects with the *Friend*. Poole, with Stuart, Montagu, and Clarkson, had been advancing money for the stamped paper for the periodical (see Campbell, *Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge*, 1901, lxxix). See the quotations from this letter above, page 33. Mrs. Sandford (*Thomas Poole and His Friends*, 2. 229) gives a wrong date, "March 31, 1809." Campbell (*op. cit.* lxxix) assigns the date March 23. Knight heads the letter "[About May, 1809]." In his *Life of Wordsworth*, 2. 135, he correctly dates it May 31, 1809. The identity between statements of this letter and that posted May 31 to Stuart (see above) fixes the date—as do the phrases "now that it has been entirely printed off for full ten days"; "the pamphlet has been lying ten days"; "The pamphlet [i. e., copies received May 23] was sent off by me ten days ago."—The "last letter" mentioned in the first line of the present letter, is probably that to Poole of March 30 (see above).

De Quincey's fault. He is no person to depute such affairs to! But the poet had not credited the fact. "*Hinc illæ lacrimæ!*"

Meanwhile, the publication of the tract was advertised in the *Courier* of May 27, Stuart giving it great prominence in the first column of the front page.⁸⁸

But the end was not yet! On June 4, Wordsworth wrote Stuart (LLP 351; part in LWF 1.458) that he had just been harassed and mortified by the discovery of a most distressing lapse regarding the substituted leaf (see above, pages 53-55). Of ten stitched copies sent him, two being "covered with green paper,"⁸⁹ there remain in his hands three copies, one of them in green paper. The copy in green has the corrected leaf; the other two have the original leaf. He fears that all the stitched copies not in green paper have the first reading. This is the more culpable because an *errata* slip, "printed on another part of the same half sheet" as the substituted leaf, is inserted in the copies that have the original leaf. He earnestly entreats Stuart to do his best to remedy the trouble. He can hardly venture to ask Stuart to see a second edition through the press; therefore he "cannot have the least hope but that such

⁸⁸ Critics have hitherto been contented to repeat the statement of the *Memoirs* (l. 384) that the pamphlet appeared at "the end of May." Knight says (PW l. xiii), "early in June." The advertisement reads: "This Day is published, by Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, / Paternoster row, price 5s. / CONCERNING the RELATIONS of GREAT / BRITAIN, SPAIN, and PORTUGAL to each other, / and to the COMMON ENEMY at this Crisis; and specifi- / cally as affected by the CONVENTION OF CINTRA: the whole brought to the test of those Principles by which alone / the Independence and Freedom of Nations can be preserved / or recovered. By WILLIAM WORDSWORTH." This notice is repeated in the issues of May 29, page 1, col. 1, and June 1, page 1, col. 3.

⁸⁹ Wise, *Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of William Wordsworth*, London, 1916, 75, says of the pamphlet, "Issued (or at all events made up), in the first instance, 'stabbed' and without wrappers. Subsequently issued in drab paper boards, without lettering or label. It is curious that every copy of the book in original boards I have met with had been pierced with stab-holes through the inner margins. The inference is that the whole edition was originally made up 'stabbed,' and that a remaining portion was put into boards at some later period." One wonders about the binding into boards. The book fell flat from the first. The stab-holes show it was not originally intended to be bound up. The copies I have seen have the title and last page very dirty. They have all been bound up at a later date by their owners. Drab boards was a common binding in the first two decades of the century.

blunders and negligence would take place, in inserting the alterations, as to render the book utterly unintelligible. In fact," and he puts much of the story into a sentence, "nothing can be more unfortunate for a work of this kind than a residence so far from London, and so unfavorable to communication with the post." If a second edition is called for, let it be run off from a copy of the tract, corrected from the *errata* slip and the *errata* since sent off.

A number of copies with the original reading at page 97 are extant, though such are more rare than are copies with the corrected reading.⁹⁰ Grosart's, as we shall show (see below, page 76), is the only reprint that has the corrected reading.

We have seen that Wordsworth sent away a few complimentary copies from the fourteen he had asked for (LWF 1.391 ¶ 3, 458-9).⁹¹ He directed De Quincey and Stuart to send off some others. Evidently Stuart, perhaps partly by the author's direction, gave away a number of copies at his own expense (LWF 1.465 ¶ 1; LLP 357). Henry Crabb Robinson gave a copy to a Mr. Puhl (see below, page 68). Wordsworth seems to have been desirous that his friends of non-political bent should buy the pamphlet, if they wished to see it.⁹²

So ends the story of the publication. As late as June 17 (LLP 354 ¶ 2), the author was hoping that a second edition would be called for. But no sale was effected for even the first. In 1851, Bishop Wordsworth stated in the *Memoirs* (1.405) that of the five hundred⁹³ copies printed, "many copies were disposed of by the publishers as waste paper, and went to the trunkmakers; and now there is scarcely any volume published in this century which is so difficult to be met with . . . ; and if it were now reprinted, it would come before the public with almost the unimpaired freshness of a new work."

The early rarity of the tract appeared at the sale of the library

⁹⁰ Wise, *op. cit.* 77-8.

⁹¹ We are told (Grosart, *Prose Works of Wordsworth*, 1. xvii) that Wordsworth reserved no copy for himself at the time of publication. If so, he had a copy later, for to Stuart on June 22, 1817, he quoted (LLP 369) pretty accurately a passage from the tract.

⁹² See Lamb's letter to Coleridge of June 7, 1809; Dorothy's to Mrs. Clarkson, LWF 1. 462 ¶ 3; Wordsworth's to Poole, Knight, *Life* 2. 134 ¶ 2, and to Wrangham, LWF 1. 427 ¶ 2.

⁹³ See LWF 1. 476 ¶ 2.

of Sir James Mackintosh (died May 30, 1832), when a copy is said to have brought ten guineas.⁹⁴ At present the slightness of interest in the original edition, and the scarcity of copies, are shown by the offering of the book only now and then in the booksellers' catalogues, and by the great variation in the prices asked. In December, 1920, I learned from direct inquiry that no copy was owned by the Philadelphia Mercantile Library, the Library Company of Philadelphia, the Boston Public Library, the Newberry Library of Chicago, the Public Library of Chicago, and the libraries of the following universities—Princeton, Illinois, Chicago, Johns Hopkins, Yale, Cornell, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania. A copy is owned by the New York Public Library, one by Mrs. St. John, one by the Harvard College Library (purchased in May, 1918), and one (defective) by Columbia University. On these four copies, see below, pages 67, 75.

Though the tract can have had but little circulation, and produced (despite the implication of Professor Dicey)⁹⁵ little, if any, immediate direct political effect, and probably but little direct influence later, we have seen that eminent readers hailed it in 1809, and have cherished it since, as, in the larger elements of its matter and in its form, one of the noblest extended pieces of English prose.

Dorothy wrote De Quincey on Thursday, June 23⁹⁶ (LWF 1.467 ¶ 2), "We have heard from several quarters that the pamphlet has made considerable impression, I mean among a few." To Mrs. Clarkson, she wrote (LWF 1.476 ¶ 2) on "Sunday, (I know not the day of the month) 26th or 27th August," "Tell us what you think of William's book. All the judicious seem to admire it. Many are astonished with the wisdom of it but nobody buys! An edition of 500 is not yet sold. . . ." On June 15 (LWF 1.462 ¶ 3), she had remarked to Mrs. Clarkson, "What a pity that it did not come out sooner! It would have been then

⁹⁴Grosart, *Prose Works of Wordsworth*, I. xvii.

⁹⁵*Statesmanship of Wordsworth*, 94; Oxford reprint of tract, xxxii.

⁹⁶Headed, "Grasmere, Thursday, I believe about the 25th June." Thursday was the 23rd. The postscript says, "Coleridge has been with us nearly a fortnight." Dorothy's letter of Wednesday, June 15, says, "At 10 o'clock yesterday morning Coleridge arrived." Wordsworth's letter to Stuart, posted June 17 (LLP 355 ¶ 2), says, "Coleridge arrived here yesterday morning."

much plainer to all readers (very few of whom will bear in mind *the time* at which the tract was written). What a true prophet he has been! C. has had an interesting letter from Charles Lamb."

On June 15⁹⁷ (LLP 354; part in LWF 1.464), Wordsworth wrote Stuart of the pamphlet, "I learn from Charles Lamb that everybody whom he has heard speak of it in town extols it highly." The allusions are to Lamb's kind, brave letter of the 7th to Coleridge. He and Mary have moved to No. 4, Inner Temple Lane. But the removal has brought on another of Mary's attacks. Of the tract he says, ". . . I am to have it to-morrow lent me, and if Wordsworth don't send me an order for one upon Longmans, I will buy it. It is greatly extolled and liked by all who have seen it." We have noticed Lamb's enthusiastic praise in his letter of October 30.

By the first of August, Dorothy had heard of no reviews of the tract, and had found none in the Book Club at Kendal (LWF 1.471). But, in September, a very favorable notice of two pages appeared in the *British Critic* (34.305-6). In the fall, Henry Crabb Robinson, who was to become the trusted friend of all Wordsworth's later years, published his first article over his own name.⁹⁸ He had just returned from Spain. The article criticized a group of four writings on Spanish affairs, and appeared in the fourth and last number of Tipper's and Cumberland's ill-starred quarterly, *The London Review* (2.231 ff.).⁹⁹ Some eighteen of its forty-five pages were a review of the Cintra pamphlet, not only enthusiastic and justly appreciative, but through its quotation of finer passages most likely to promote interest in the book. One hopes Wordsworth saw the article. We have indicated that Robinson praised particularly the latter part of the pamphlet, that included in the long insertion which was drawn from materials which would have been worked into the rejected "second part" (see above, page 41).

Beyond the judgments of Southey and Coleridge noted at the opening of this study, there are to be indicated two letters on the

⁹⁷ LLP and LWF both say this has the postmark "June 17, 1809." The letter was written June 15 (see note 96).

⁹⁸ *Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence*, Boston, 1869, I. 189.

⁹⁹ A copy of the *Review* is in the Yale University Library.

reasons for the failure of the tract to reach the public. To Sir Walter Scott, Southey wrote on July 30, 1809, "Wordsworth's pamphlet will fail of producing any general effect, because the sentences are long and involved; and his friend, De Quincey, who corrected the press, has rendered them more obscure by an unusual system of punctuation. This fault will outweigh all its merits. . . . I impute Wordsworth's lack of perspicuity to two causes—his admiration of Milton's prose, and his habit of dictating instead of writing: if he were his own scribe his eye would tell him where to stop; but, in dictating, his own thoughts are to himself familiarly intelligible, and he goes on, unconscious either of the length of the sentence, or the difficulty a common reader must necessarily find in following its meaning to the end, and unravelling all its involutions."¹⁰⁰

On June 13, Coleridge wrote Stuart from Grasmere (LLP 167; LC 548), "I have just read Wordsworth's pamphlet, and more than fear that your friendly expectations of its sale and influence have been too sanguine. Had I not known the author I would willingly have travelled from St. Michael's Mount to Johnny Groat's House on a pilgrimage to see and reverence him." But the public has lost interest in the Convention. Moreover, Wordsworth's style, so acceptable to Coleridge and a few others, is not adapted to the understanding or the liking of common readers. A great hindrance is due to "Mr. De Quincey's strange and most mistaken system of punctuation. The periods are often alarmingly long, perforce of their construction, but De Quincey's punctuation has made several of them immeasurable, and perplexed half the rest. Never was a stranger whim than the notion that , ; : and . could be made logical symbols, expressing all the diversities of logical connection." Lastly, "readers even of judgment, may complain of a want of shade and background; that it is all foreground, all in hot tints; that the first note is pitched at the height of the instrument, and never suffered to sink. . . ."¹⁰¹ I much admired our young friend's note on Sir John Moore and his dispatch; it was excellently arranged and urged."

It is curious that, though De Quincey seems ever ready to talk of personal matters, though he published much about Coleridge

¹⁰⁰ *Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey*. London, 1850, 3. 246.

¹⁰¹ Here follows matter quoted at the opening of this study.

and Wordsworth and his earlier relations with them, and though he wrote of his sojourn at Allan Bank in 1808-1809 and of his settling at Dove Cottage, he apparently printed nothing about the tract or his part in it. The extant De Quincey family letters published by Japp offer merely an indication that perhaps he sent a copy of the pamphlet to his brother, Richard.¹⁰²

Critics have ignored or have said little of De Quincey's work on the pamphlet. That little has been an echoing of the few expressions of the author, Southey, and Coleridge, of which the quotations just made contain the pith. Of commendation the critics¹⁰³ repeat merely Coleridge's and Wordsworth's remarks, caught up by Christopher Wordsworth, that De Quincey wrote the Appendix, and drew up the note on Sir John Moore's letter "in a masterly manner." The burden of their meagre criticism is ever a slurring reiteration of what Wordsworth communicated to correspondents, and what Coleridge and Southey handed on with more definiteness. This adverse judgment implies that the pamphlet failed, first, because of obscurity due to, or at least not obviated by, De Quincey's punctuation; and, secondly, largely because of delays through irritation of the printers arising from innumerable corrections which were the product of De Quincey's old-maidenish punctiliousness and incapacity to act directly and promptly, and especially the result of his foolish insistence on the observance of an absurd system of punctuation that he had devised.

Our discussion of the history of the printing, while it does not exculpate De Quincey wholly from responsibility in the delay of the work, does show clearly causes sufficient for that delay in Wordsworth's constant changes, his inexactness and lack of order, his unfamiliarity with the pointing of prose, his neglect of reasonable precautions for presenting good "copy," and his unthinking imposition on De Quincey of a variety of burdens which an active sense of fairness, the rules of ordinary consideration, and a moderate notion of efficiency, would have caused him to bear himself, or have rendered unnecessary.

The prime ground of the adverse criticism of De Quincey's work is his handling of the punctuation. Wordsworth's admission to

¹⁰² *De Quincey Memorials* 1. 258 ¶ 3.

¹⁰³ *E. g.*, Knight, *PW* 1. xii; Harper, *William Wordsworth* 2. 176 ¶ 2; *D. N. B.*, s. v., *Wordsworth* 63. 20 col. 2. See *Memoirs*, 1. 384.

Poole (LWF 1.456 ¶ 1) of the inadequateness of his own punctuation, and of the necessity of his delegating the pointing to some one, and so to De Quincey, has been ignored. With some reason have been passed over his statements to De Quincey (LWF 1.452 ¶ 1), “. . . the punctuation pleases me much . . . I think, indeed, your plan of punctuation admirable”—for Wordsworth was evidently speaking otherwise to other persons. In one (LLP 345) of the two extant passages where he speaks adversely of the punctuation, he speaks not from knowledge, but from inference—“De Quincey must have,” “the printer must have”; and in the other (LWF 1.456) he puts the blame on the punctuation in a rather general way—since he had not mastered punctuation in prose, he had delegated the matter to De Quincey. “*Hinc illæ lacrimæ!*” He must, however, have spoken out more plainly and emphatically to Coleridge and Southey, to give them the impressions they communicated to others.

Hitherto, an independent judgment of what De Quincey actually did with the punctuation, has not been sought by critics. A basis for such an estimate becomes available in a comparison of the articles in the *Courier* and the reprint of them in the pamphlet. In making the comparison, one must, of course, admit that the punctuation of the articles may have been somewhat affected by the compositors, and perhaps by the regular policy of the *Courier*. It must also be remembered that, though some of the punctuation of the tract may not be wholly due to De Quincey, it was accepted by him.

The tract shows slightly over one hundred and fifty changes in punctuation from the *Courier* text. These consist chiefly in the correction of palpable errors, in the more liberal use of commas, and in the dividing of long sentences into two (1809, 3 l. 4; 4 ll. 13, 26; 8 ll. 13, 17, 18; 11 l. 4; 22 ll. 13, 12, and 4 from end;—G, 37 l. 3; 38 ll. 1, 12; 40 l. 3 from end, 41 ll. 1, 2; 42 l. 6 from end; 51 ll. 6, 7, 13—K, 113 l. 3; 114 l. 16, and l. 10 from end; 117 ll. 6, 2, and 1 from end; 120 l. 7; 130 ll. 7, 8, 15;—Oxf, 5 l. 3; 6 ll. 12, 25; 10 ll. 11, 15, 16; 12 l. 4 from end; 24 ll. 12, 13, 21). At two points (1809, 12 l. 4 from end, 16 l. 5 from end; G, 44 s. 2, 47 last line; K, 121 l. 11 from end, 125 l. 7; Oxf, 14 l. 25, 18 l. 21), two sentences are united, in each case wisely, especially in view of the context. The punctuation of the *Courier*

is poor and often inaccurate. Comparison shows indisputably that, in the parallel passages, the punctuation of the tract is very much better in consistency both from sentence to sentence and within the given sentence; in the accurate location of the pointing; and notably in clearness—an issue of immense importance in such a style. It is of interest that in the matter which Coleridge claimed particularly as his own (*i. e.*, the last two columns of the second *Courier* article; see above, page 28), the changes are proportionately less numerous than in the rest of the matter; for here the pointing of the *Courier* is better. The changes here are, however, still more marked improvements than are those made elsewhere.

The comparison of the two texts is, then, distinctly to the advantage of De Quincey's practice.

When one considers the punctuation of the tract as a whole on its own merits, one is forced to observe that it is not eccentric or objectionable in any just sense. To Stuart, Coleridge blamed (LLP 168) De Quincey for the length of the sentences; he recognized that Wordsworth's sentences were "often alarmingly long, perforce of their construction," and held that De Quincey "made several of them immeasurable, and perplexed half the rest." That De Quincey or any one should venture on any considerable breaking up, and so rephrasing, of these long periods, is not tenable. Such modification would not wisely be undertaken by any editor on such a scale, and with such inevitable effects on the style. It could not be done to the satisfaction of an author so watchful of details as Wordsworth was in these months. It is interesting that in the portion claimed by Coleridge as his work, the tract corrects one of the worst errors in sentence division (1809, 22 ll. 13, 12—"In," "therefore"—and 4 from end; G, 51 ll. 6, 7, 13; K, 130 ll. 7, 8, 15; Oxf, 24 ll. 12, 13, 21).

The pamphlet exhibits a very liberal use of commas and, especially for parenthetical and adjoined expression, of dashes. But both of these types of point were much more in use in 1809 than they are today. Moreover, when one studies the long sentences heaped up with parallels, parentheses, restrictions, and added details, one realizes that for mere clearness there were necessitated in the tract an unusual amount of pointing, and at times the use of means other than the ordinary. Throughout the tract, the punctuation is logical; it is rarely inconsistent. Indeed, one is

astonished at its consistency when one considers Wordsworth's confessed weakness in punctuation of prose, his request to De Quincey to make up for his deficiencies, and the probable state of the manuscript that De Quincey had to correct and to present to the printer, apparently without copying. Anyone who has attempted to revise the punctuation of handwriting with the irregular pointing that Wordsworth's would seem likely to have had, and that the *Courier* articles present, will congratulate De Quincey on his success. But one must compliment the editor particularly on the clearness that his pointing has given to the involved expression. Happy should be he, who, through his own efforts or those of an editor, attains such adequate pointing as is shown in the tract.

It is, indeed, possible that some or much of this merit was acquired through corrections in the proofs, with consequent delay of the pamphlet. But the pointing in "copy," if entered legibly, should be followed directly by the compositor, irrespective of its basis. It is not unlikely, also, that a compositor—especially one for long in the state that the letters record (LLP 338, 156; see above, page 51) — would make much delay through failure to follow "copy" whose sentences were so unusually involved and varied in their elements.

We may conclude our story of the history of the tract with some notes on the variant copies and the text.

The student must be on the lookout for specimens of the pamphlet with the earlier title-page (see above, page 42); with (1) the cancel half-leaf, pp. 97-98, 103-4, or (2) the cancel leaf pp. 97-98 *pasted* in (see pages 53, 68, 69); with the original leaf pp. 97-9 (see above, page 59); with the *errata* leaf 1 (next after page 216, on 2) next after the title (see below, page 74); with corrections in De Quincey's hand (see below, page 74); or with the error on page 8 (see below, pages 68, 69).

In the Columbia University Library is a copy (Shelf-number 946.06Z) of the pamphlet, bound with other pamphlets. It has the original leaf at pages 97-98. Its *errata* leaf is pasted in next after the leaf of the title-page, and next preceding the "Advertisement." Pages 3-8 are missing.—In the New York Public Library is a copy (Shelf-mark DGO) in the Evert A. Duyckinck Collection, bound by "Wm. Smith, New York." It has the substituted leaf

at pages 97-98, with no signs of pasteing. The *errata* leaf is located as in the Columbia copy.—In the Harvard College Library is a copy (Shelf-number Fr 1841.9.5) purchased in May, 1918, from the collection of the Marquis de Olivart of Madrid. On its title-page is written in old ink: "To Mr. Puhl with H. C. Robinson's compliments." It has the substituted leaf with pp. 97-98 pasted on the remains of the inner edge of the old leaf, which was cut out.—None of these copies has corrections of the text in ink.

I have a copy of the tract with the usual title-page, and with the original leaf at pages 97-98. The *errata* leaf is pasted in between the title leaf and the "Advertisement." It is clean on both sides. The back of the last leaf, page 216, is dirty, as is the title-page. Hence, it is clear that the *errata* did not follow page 216 (see below, page 74). A peculiarity of this copy is on page 8 line 7 from end. The line reads "by a relevation oft state of being that admits." The *t* in *oft* has part of the upper tip of the cross vertical stroke, and part of the left tip of the cross stroke, missing. A space of three letters follows before "state." Knight, Grosart, and the Oxford text all read "revelation of the state" (K, 118 l. 11; G, 41; Oxf, 10 l. 9 from end). As the spacing shows, there was an error here, with possibly an attempt at correction. This is supported by the variant reading in my De Quincey copy (see below). The Columbia copy lacks the page. The New York Public Library copy has the *t*, with two thin oblique strokes, as if with a pen, and as if to make an *a*.

I have also a unique copy bound up in early nineteenth-century calf, with a copy of Wordsworth's *A Letter to a Friend of Robert Burns*, 1816; and two pamphlets of William Ellery Channing, Boston and London, 1828. Two greenish gray blank leaves of a very light shade are bound between each pair of tracts; and two precede the *Cintra*, which is the first piece in the volume. On the first page of a white flyleaf preceding these last, is a "Table of Contents" for the volume, in the hand of De Quincey.

The *Cintra* has the usual title-page (see above, page 42). On its upper right-hand margin is "from the Author," in what looks like the hand of Wordsworth. This title-page is preceded by a copy of the earlier title-page, of which Wise has seen but one other copy (see above, page 42). The earlier title is mounted on a leaf of the greenish gray paper. It corresponds exactly with the fac-

simile printed by Wise. The tract has pasted in between pages 96 and 99 the substituted leaf (pp. 97-98). Page 99 has adhering to its inner margin some remains of slate brown paper clearly pasted on before the inserted leaf was pasted closer to the inner edge. The tract extends to and includes the leaf with page 191. This last is pasted on a leaf of the thick greenish gray paper. There is no more of the printed tract. Next after the back of page 191 are bound eighteen leaves of plain white paper. The first nine of these contain sixteen and a half pages of manuscript, written on both sides of the leaves. The manuscript is apparently De Quincey's. It is headed "Appendix (supplied by T. De Quincey)." The name is identical with De Quincey's signature. The manuscript is a verbatim copy of the Appendix to the tract as it was printed. It stops at the end of Appendix F, the rest of the inserted leaves being blank. A peculiarity of this copy of the tract is that page 8, line 7 from end, reads, "by a revelation of a state of being that admits." The *a* in *ofa* is slightly defective, but is clearly an *a* and not a *t*. There is no space between it and *of*. A space of three letters follows *ofa* before "state." This copy contains, also, at the points indicated below (see page 75), corrections in De Quincey's hand of certain *errata*, mostly from the list that Sara Hutchinson sent him (see below, page 72): "I do not suppose they will give any pleasure, or be of much use, except for your own copy, unless a Second Edition should be called for. . . ." (LWF 1. 447).—This copy I purchased from P. J. and A. E. Dobell of London, May 25, 1915.

The variations in punctuation between the *Courier* articles (see above, pages 25, 27) and the parallel passages in the pamphlet, have already been indicated (see above, page 65).

The verbal variations are few and insignificant. They are as follows:

Courier, "dependencies which the English people are acquainted with," for "dependences [K, "dependencies"] with which the English people are acquainted" (1809, 3 l. 7; G, 37 l. 5; K, 113 l. 6; Oxf, 5 l. 6);—*Courier*, "and the universal participation in passion . . . which it necessarily included," for "and through the universal participation in passions . . . which this necessarily included" (1809, 3 l. 17; G, 37 l. 13; K, 113 l. 15; Oxf, 5 l. 17);—*Courier*, "we were astounded," for "we were astonished" (1809,

4. l. 3; G, 37 l. 25; K, 114 l. 8; Oxf, 6. l. 3);—*Courier*, "to give way in connection with him to that unqualified admiration of courage and skill, to be exalted . . . and purified . . . and benign dispositions to the horrors of ordinary war; it was felt that upon this mission the soldier would be abundantly recompensed by the enthusiasm of paternal love," for "to give way to that unqualified admiration of courage and skill, made it impossible in relation to him to be exalted . . . and to be purified . . . and humane dispositions to the horrors of ordinary war; it was felt that for such loss the benign and accomplished soldier would upon this mission be abundantly recompensed by the enthusiasm of fraternal love" (1809, 5 l. 3; G, 38 l. 23; K, 115 l. 3; Oxf, 7 l. 2);—*Courier*, "as including with them an immense," for "as associating them with an immense" (1809, 6 l. 26; G, 39 l. 30; K, 116 l. 17; Oxf, 8 l. 23);—*Courier*, "wrongs had been," for "wrongs have been" (1809, 11 l. 5 from end; G, 43 l. 18; K, 120 l. 6 from end; Oxf, 13 l. 25);—*Courier*, "people of Spain, and as to their competence," for "people of Spain, both as to their sanctity and truth, and as to their competence" (1809, 13 l. 22; G, 44 l. 26; K, 122 l. 13; Oxf, 15 l. 13);—*Courier*, "myself to point out," for "myself to suggest" (1809, 13 l. 31; G, 44 l. 34; K, 122 l. 21; Oxf, 15 l. 22);—*Courier*, "Now, it is manifest," for "It is manifest" (1809, 14 l. 9; G, 45 l. 4; K, 122 l. 7 from end; Oxf, 15 l. 2 from end);—*Courier*, "thoughts of final success," for "thoughts of success" (1809, 15 l. 23; G, 46 l. 3; K, 124 l. 2; Oxf, 17 l. 11);—*Courier*, "publications, in addition to," for "publications, sanctioned by" (1809, 15 l. 4 from end; G, 46 l. 13; K, 124 l. 12; Oxf, 17 l. 23);—*Courier*, "which have not been called," for "which have not yet been called" (1809, 16 l. 2; G, 46 l. 17; K, 124 l. 17; Oxf, 17 l. 28);—*Courier*, "in proportion as the people," for "in proportion as a people" (1809, 16 l. 7; G, 46 l. 20; K, 124 l. 22; Oxf, 17 l. 32);—*Courier*, "and the condition," for "and condition" (1809, 16 l. 25; G, 46 l. 34; K, 124 last line; Oxf, 18 l. 13);—*Courier*, "found hard," for "found harsh" (1809, 16 l. 2 from end; G, 47 l. 3; K, 125 l. 9; Oxf, 18 l. 24);—*Courier*, "by all aids and appliances in their power," for "warrantable, by all aids and appliances"¹⁰⁴ (1809, 19 l. 4; G, 48 l. 23; K, 127 l. 4; Oxf, 20 l. 9 from end);—*Courier*, "physical powers," for

¹⁰⁴ See *errata*, below, page 73.

"physical power" (1809, 21 l. 17; G, 50 l. 11; K, 129 l. 5; Oxf, 23 l. 4);—*Courier*, "army or sets of armies," for "army or set of armies" (1809, 23 l. 22; G, 51 l. 32; K, 130 l. 2 from end; Oxf, 25 l. 9);—*Courier*, "excellencies that render," for "excellencies which render" (1809, 23 l. 6 from end; G, 51 last line; K, 131 l. 8; Oxf, 25 l. 19);—*Courier*, "thing which I shall say," for "thing that I shall say" (1809, 24 l. 5; G, 52 l. 8; K, 131 l. 18; Oxf, 25 l. 8 from end).

As we have shown, the hoped-for second edition was not demanded. To Professor Henry Reed, the poet wrote on September 14, 1840 (LWF 3. 211), "I am much pleased by what you say in your letter of the 18th of May last upon the tract of *The Convention of Cintra*, and I think myself with some interest upon its being reprinted hereafter, along with my other writings. But the respect which, in common with all the rest of the rational part of the world, I bear for the Duke of Wellington, will prevent my reprinting the pamphlet during his life-time. . . . I am convinced that nothing they [the Duke's published dispatches] contain could alter my opinion of the injurious tendency of that or any other Convention conducted upon such principles."¹⁰⁶ Wordsworth is reported (*Memoirs* 2. 466) to have said, evidently late in his life, "I think my nephew, Dr. Wordsworth, will, after my death, collect and publish all I have written in prose." His biographer made a note on this, "On another occasion, I believe, he intimated a desire that his works in Prose should be edited by his son-in-law, Mr. Quillinan."

It was, however, twenty-six years after the poet's death when the first edition of his prose works was issued by Dr. A. B. Grosart, *The Prose Works of William Wordsworth*, 3 vols., London, 1876. This included (1. 31-194) the first reprint of the Cintra tract. Some notes were appended (1. 357-9). In the same edition, Grosart printed Wordsworth's letter of March 28, 1811, to Captain Charles Pasley, with its covering letter, both on the general theme of the tract. Twenty years later, Professor William Knight issued *The Prose Works of William Wordsworth*, 2 vols., London and New York, 1896, in which he included (1. 107-303) the second

¹⁰⁶ This letter is printed in full in the *Memoirs* 1. 420.—However much Professor Reed valued the tract, at the sale of his books, Mrs. St. John informs me, his copy of it brought only twenty cents.

reprint of the tract, and added the Pasley letters. The interest in Wordsworth's political views aroused by the Great War, led the Oxford Press to issue the first separate reprint, the third reprint, of the tract, in London, 1915, *Wordsworth's Tract / on the / Convention of Cintra / [Published 1809] / with / Two Letters of Wordsworth / Written in the Year 1811 / Now Republished / With an Introduction / By / A. V. Dicey*, pages xl + 244. The "two letters" are the Pasley letters.

Grosart claims (1. xxxviii), and a collation substantially supports the claim, that "Wordsworth's own [*i. e.*, those of the 1809 text] capitals, italics, punctuation, and other somewhat antique characteristics have been faithfully reproduced" in his reprint. Knight states regarding his reprint (PW 1. 113; see also 1. x.), "Several slight alterations in the text . . . have been necessary, owing to Wordsworth's inaccuracy as a reviser for the press, or his friends' inaccuracy in revising for him: *e. g.* the title of a paper, *Precautions*, is printed in three different ways in the original edition of 1809. It is made uniform in this one. Some archaic spellings have been changed, but those which were characteristic of the time are retained." Collation of the texts shows that Knight's statements are substantially correct—the variations being of the sort indicated, in the use of italics for quotation marks in titles, the employment of *etc.* for *&c.*, the change of some of the capitalization, and the like. None of the modifications are of importance. The Oxford reprint is based on Grosart, being evidently set up from a copy of Grosart's text. Professor Dicey informs me, however, that his secretary says "there were one or two cases in which the Press may apparently have used another edition." I have not collated this text throughout with Grosart's text. Probably the variations are those noted below in discussing the *errata*.

We have seen that Wordsworth was very greatly concerned over a number of errors that he discovered in the tract. He had Sara Hutchinson draw up for his letter of May 24 to De Quincey (LWF 1. 447) a list of *errata*, omitted from Knight's print of the letter, but printed by Japp.¹⁰⁶ The list comprises twelve items (not eleven, as Knight states), as follows: 1) Motto l. 6, for "zeal or

¹⁰⁶ *De Quincey Memorials*, New York, 1891, 1. 169. See above, page 56.

love," read "hate or love";—2) for "self-destroying," read "self-destroyed" (1809, 96 l. 10; G, 104 l. 7; K, 193 l. 6 from end; Oxf, 97 l. 25);—3) for "injury to itself," read "injury of itself" (1809, 123 l. 8; G, 123 l. 4 from end; K, 217 l. 23; Oxf, 124 l. 21);—4) for "obstinacy in them would," read "could" (1809, 123 l. 20; G, 124 l. 6; K, 217 l. 5 from end; Oxf, 124 l. 5 from end);—5) for "intimation, even to this Country," read "estimation even, to this Country" (1809, 153 l. 7 from end; G, 146 l. 17; K, 244 l. 20; Oxf, 155 l. 16);¹⁰⁷—6) for "principles," read "principle" (1809, 148 l. 46 from end; G, 142 l. 10 from end; K, 240 l. 6; Oxf, 150 l. 19);—7) for "loves," read "love" (1809, 169 l. 8 from end; G, 158 l. 4; K, 258 l. 20; Oxf, 171 l. 24);—8) for "triumph of human nature. It would," read "triumph of human nature, it would" (1809, 178 l. 17; G, 164 l. 21; K, 266 l. 8; Oxf, 180 l. 20);—9) for "calenture to which," read "calenture of fancy to which" (1809, 184 l. 7 from end; G, 169 l. 12; K, 271 l. 6 from end; Oxf, 187 l. 2);—10) for "act and deed," read "word and act" (1809, 188 l. 9; G, 171 l. 8 from end; K, 274 l. 7 from end; Oxf, 190 l. 16);—11) for "abuses," read "abusers" (1809, 186 l. 16; G, 170 l. 18; K, 273 l. 9; Oxf, 188 l. 22);—12) Latin quotation at the end, for "expletè nihil," read "expleti nihil" (1809, 191 l. 14; G, 174 l. 4; K, 277 l. 19; Oxf, 193 l. 19).

The 1809 copies of the tract regularly have an *errata* leaf. This contains eight items, none of which is in Sara Hutchinson's list: 1) for "not only the virtue," read "not only the virtues" (1809, 4 l. 6 from end; G, 38 l. 17; K, 114 l. 5 from end; Oxf, 6 l. 7 from end);—2) for "aetually," read "actually" (1809, 7 l. 11; G, 40 l. 7; K, 116 l. 2 from end; Oxf, 9 l. 8);—3) begin a paragraph at "But, from the moment . . ." (1809, 8 l. 24; G, 41 ¶ 2; K, 118 ¶ 2; Oxf, 10 ¶ 2);—4) for "need not to say," read "need not say" (1809, 12 l. 26; G, 44 l. 1; K, 121 l. 22; Oxf, 14 l. 18);—5) for "warrantable, by all aids and appliances," read "by all warrantable aids and appliances" (1809, 19 l. 4; G, 48 l. 23; K, 127 l. 4; Oxf, 20 l. 9 from end);—6) for "twenty-three," read "twenty-two" (1809, 89 l. 6 from end; G, 99 l. 22; K, 188 l. 12; Oxf, 91 l. 13);—7) for "incidentally," read "incidentally" (1809,

¹⁰⁷ Knight reads, "intimation even, to"; Grosart and Oxford read, "intimation, even to."

100 l. 14; G, 107 l. 6; K, 197 l. 17; Oxf, 101 l. 27);—8) for "In every part of the town were," read "In every part of the town where" (1809, 182 l. 11 from end; G, 167 l. 13 from end; K, 269 l. 2 from end; Oxf, 184 l. 5 from end).

Wordsworth stated (LLP 352) to Stuart that the *errata* just enumerated "were printed on another part of the same half sheet" as the corrected "contempt and hatred" leaf (see above, page 59), substituted as pages 97-98 of the tract. Wise says¹⁰⁸ that the paper of the *errata* leaf is "slightly thinner than that employed for the body of the work, and for the two cancel-leaves" (pages 97-98, 103-104). If the difference in paper exists, it is difficult to detect. He states questionably that, as the *errata* leaf is in all the copies that he has seen, it was "provided at a much earlier date" than the cancel-leaf or (as he says) "leaves." But if both these leaves were prepared for insertion at the same time, the *errata* might well be inserted, while the inner leaf might naturally be sometimes overlooked, just because its place is in the inner part of the pamphlet. Wise says the copies without the corrected leaf or "leaves" are "really rare," much rarer than those with the leaf or "leaves." He also states that the *errata* leaf follows page 216. I have seen only bound copies of the tract. In each of these the *errata* leaf is clean and follows the title leaf, and the dirty state of the page 216 shows that that was the last leaf of the book before some owner had it bound. It is true that my De Quincey copy, which lacks pages 193 to end, lacks the *errata* leaf—but this copy is a special copy.

In the letter of June 4 (LLP 353), the poet requested Stuart, in case of a second edition, to use for the press a copy "with the Errata corrected—both those first printed and those since sent off." What those "since sent off" were, I do not discover. Perhaps they are the corrections sent to De Quincey by Sara Hutchinson (see above, pages 56, 72), with the suggestion that they might be used for a second edition (LWF 1. 447).

Still another list is available. Sara Hutchinson requested (LWF 1. 448) De Quincey to correct with his pen the errors (apparently those in her list) in the copy he was to send to Lord Lonsdale. Japp has stated,¹⁰⁹ ". . . though many copies of the pam-

¹⁰⁸ *Bibliography of the Writings . . . of Wm. Wordsworth* 79.

¹⁰⁹ *De Quincey Memorials* 1. 166.

phlet were circulated with certain corrections made in ink in De Quincey's hand, one of these having been sent to Sir George Beaumont, the editor allowed the pamphlet to reappear [*sic!*] without them."

My De Quincey copy has the following corrections in De Quincey's hand: 1) Motto, "hate" for "zeal";—2) "say" for "to say" (1809, 12 l. 26; G, 44 l. 1; K, 121 l. 22; Oxf, 14 l. 18);—3) "destroyed" for "destroying" (1809, 96 l. 10; G, 104 l. 7; K, 193 l. 6; Oxf, 97 l. 25);—4) "distinguish" for "discover" (1809, 109 l. 13; G, 113 l. 10; K, 205 l. 14; Oxf, 110 l. 25);—5) "injury of," for "injury to" (1809, 123 l. 8; G, 123 l. 4 from end; K, 217 l. 23; Oxf, 124 l. 21);—6) "could," for "would" (1809, 123 l. 20; G, 124 l. 6; K, 217 l. 5 from end; Oxf, 124 l. 5 from end);—7) "love" for "loves" (1809, 169 l. 8 from end; G, 158 l. 4; K, 258 l. 20; Oxf, 171 l. 24);—8) "it" for "It" (1809, 178 l. 17; G, 164 l. 21; K, 266 l. 9; Oxf, 180 l. 20);—9) "calenture of fancy" for "calenture" (1809, 184 l. 7 from end; G, 169 l. 12; K, 271 l. 6 from end; Oxf, 187 l. 2);—10) "abusers," for "abuses" (1809, 186 l. 16; G, 170 l. 18; K, 273 l. 9; Oxf, 188 l. 22);—11) "with word," for "with act" (*sic!*—1809, 188 l. 9; G, 171 l. 8 from end; K, 274 l. 7 from end; Oxf, 190 l. 16).

The copy owned by Southey, as is present owner, Mrs. St. John, of Ithaca, New York, has kindly informed me, has in ink all the corrections of the De Quincey copy, except No. 4. It has, the De Quincey has not, the "expleti" correction on page 191. Both the De Quincey copy and the Southey copy omit Nos. 5 and 6 of the Hutchinson list. They add two items (Nos. 2 and 4) not in the Hutchinson list. Item 2 of their lists is Item 4 of the printed *errata* issued with the pamphlet, and is the only item of that list that is entered in the inked corrections.

These various *errata* lists are not in themselves of great value. They acquire importance, however, to one interested in Wordsworth's state of mind and his wishes. Moreover, they are essential in the determining of a correct text, especially in view of their handling by the editors of the three reprints.

Grosart, Knight, and the Oxford Press, all adopt in their texts all the corrections in the printed *errata* issued with the pamphlet. Of the Hutchinson list, Knight adopts all the corrections except

No. 5, where he shifts the comma to follow "even," but does not substitute "estimation" for "intimation." Knight saw the original letter. Japp may have misread "estimation" for "intimation." Grosart and Dicey adopt none of the corrections of this list.

Of the inked corrections, Knight adopts all but No. 4. This and Nos. 1 and 2 are the only items of the inked corrections that do not appear in the Hutchinson list. Item 2 appears in the printed list. Item 1 appears in the letter (LWF 1. 446) in which the Hutchinson list was sent. Hence, while Knight used the printed and Hutchinson lists, he did not use the inked corrections, Grosart and the Oxford press correct none of the passages with the ink corrections, except No. 2, which is in the printed list. Clearly they used no *errata* list except the printed one.

It is evident that Knight's is the most correct text, as far as these *errata* go. It must be corrected by substituting "distinguish" for "discover" on its page 205 l. 14. We must bear in mind, however, that spellings, abbreviations, and the like, are preserved most closely in Grosart's text (see above, page 72), which is closely followed by the Oxford text.

But Knight must be corrected also for the libel passage that caused the cancellation of the leaf (see above, pages 53, 59). Apparently, Knight printed from a copy that had the original leaf. He has the original "contempt and hatred" reading (K, 194 ll. 8 ff. from end). Grosart printed from a copy with the corrected leaf, for he prints (K, 104 ll. 2 ff. from end) the corrected reading proposed by Wordsworth. Oddly, the Oxford text, which followed the text of Grosart, has (Oxf, 98 l. 9 from end) the original reading. So, curiously, after all the agitation, the delay of publication, and the expense, from changes, due to the fears of the author, the alteration of the passage, and the bungling at the printer's, the form of the sentence as it originally stood is the one in which it must be read in two of the three reprints, and in both the editions that are still "in print."

Connecticut College, New London, Connecticut.